THE PROBLEM OF SPENSER'S SONNETS.

THE received accounts of Spenser's life tell us that he was born in 1552; that, in consequence perhaps of an unrequited passion for the 'Rosalind' of his *Shepheardes Calender*, he remained a bachelor till he was over forty; that shortly after his return to Ireland in 1591 he fell in love with a lady there, by name Elizabeth and now identified as Elizabeth Boyle, married her on 11 June, 1594, after a courtship of some eighteen months, and celebrated his wooing in the *Amoretti* and his wedding in the *Epithalamion*.

In a recent number of the *Modern Language Review* this little idyll has been criticised with great acuteness and learning by Mr Percy Long. He has shown conclusively on how slight a basis of objective fact the whole neat edifice rests. That the *Amoretti* and *Epithalamion*, after being entered together on the Stationers' Register in November, 1594, were published together in 1595—this is the sole objective fact: the rest is inference and assumption.

The construction of the idyll proceeds thus. When Ponsonby published the *Amoretti* and *Epithalamion* in 1595, he described them as 'written not long since by Edmunde Spenser.' It is inferred that the wedding which the *Epithalamion* celebrates took place in the preceding year. And the allusion in the *Epithalamion* itself to 'Barnaby the bright' gives 11 June, 1594, as the actual wedding-day. It is next assumed that the *Amoretti* and *Epithalamion* are addressed to the same person; and since the *Amoretti* begin just before a New Year and last well into the next year but one, it is inferred that Spenser's courtship covered the years 1592–3–4. Finally since in Sonnet lx, written just before the New Year of 1594, the poet uses language which implies that he was then forty-one years old, we arrive by subtraction at 1552 as the year of his birth.

Mr Long attacks the received view at its weakest point, the link namely between the *Amoretti* and the *Epithalamion*. If he can sever

that link, the *Amoretti* are, so to speak, at his mercy. And a closer scrutiny seems to show that no such link exists. Nay, the epilogue to the *Epithalamion*—

> Song! made in lieu of many ornaments,
> With which my love should duly have been dect—

seems to prove that the *Amoretti* and the *Epithalamion* cannot be addressed to the same lady. For how could Spenser speak of the latter poem as 'made in lieu of many ornaments' if he had already adorned his bride with such a string of poetic jewels as the *Amoretti*?

The *Amoretti*, Mr Long concludes, were not addressed to Spenser's wife. To whom then were they addressed? Mr Long replies that they were addressed to Lady Elizabeth Carey; that they are not a genuine record of Spenser's wooing at all, but merely one of those complimentary sonnet-sequences, conventional pieces of knight-service, which were in vogue at the time.

Mr Long's theory grows more and more upon us as he reviews the relations of Spenser to Lady Carey. She was one of the daughters of Sir John Spenser of Althorpe. She was the eldest of three sisters—the two others being Lady Strange and Lady Compton and Mountegle—with whom Spenser claimed kindred, and (like Goldsmith's spendthrift) 'had his claim allowed'; to all of whom he dedicated poems in the *Complaints* volume of 1591; and all of whom he celebrated in *Colin Clout* under the names of Phyllis, Charillis and Amaryllis. But while Spenser thus paid court to all three sisters, he singled out Lady Carey for special devotion. Charillis is praised at much greater length and with much greater ardour than either of her sisters; and the name Charillis, says Mr Long, is an anagram for Eliz. Carey. Again, the dedication of *Muiopotmos* to Lady Carey is couched in warmer terms than either the dedication of the *Teares of the Muses* to Lady Strange or of *Prosopopoia* to Lady Compton. Finally, Spenser paid Lady Carey a compliment which he paid neither to her sisters nor to any other lady 'in especial' save only the Countess of Pembroke (Sidney's sister)—he inscribed to her one of the Dedicatory Sonnets appended to the first instalment of the *Faerie Queene*. This inscription marked him out, in the language of the day, as her 'servant.'

Now in this Dedicatory Sonnet the poet promises, when time permits, to display his good will 'in ampler wise.' How did he make good this promise? Not in *Muiopotmos*, which is but an airy trifle, and in any case contains no praise of any lady. He made it good, says Mr Long, in the *Amoretti* and in the *Faerie Queene*, VI, x.

There is nothing improbable in all this so far. It is not at all unlikely that Spenser, while still heart-whole, might pay a conventional courtship to Lady Carey; nor even that he might do so when he had been some years married. But it is not so easy to believe that he could have conducted an imaginary courtship with one lady at the very time when he was really courting another, and then have published the poetic records of both affairs in one volume. Yet this is what we must believe, if Spenser was married in 1594. For the *Amoretti*, as published, cannot be shifted off the years 1592–3–4, by reason of the reference in Sonnet lxxx to the completion of *six* books of the *Faerie Queene*. For *F. Q.*, v, xi contains an allusion to Henri IV which must be later than 25 July, 1593; and though I do not press that argument (for I suspect the latter portion of *F. Q.*, v, xi to be an afterthought) it is certain (from the change that he made in the Scudamour-Amoret story) that Spenser did not begin Book IV until after the publication of Books I—III; and he cannot have finished Book VI before 1594, even if he wrote the second three books twice as fast as he had written the first three. Mr Long does not indeed use these arguments, but he would probably admit their force; he evidently feels the difficulty of allowing the real and the imaginary wooing to synchronize, and he seeks to avoid it by disputing the received date of the former. There are two reasons, he holds, for believing that Spenser was married before 1594: (1) one account says that he had five children, not four; (2) in 1603 his eldest son Sylvanus appears in a petition, and there is nothing to show that he did not act in person.

Such is Mr Long's main argument. Now it is vain to try to rehabilitate the traditional view while the epilogue to the *Epithalamion* blocks the way. I therefore give it in full:

> Song! made in lieu of many ornaments,
> With which my love should duly have been dect,
> Which cutting off through hasty accidents,
> Ye would not stay your dew time to expect,
> But promist both to recompens;
> Be unto her a goodly ornament,
> And for short time an endlesse moniment.

We have seen how Mr Long takes this. But I submit that to interpret 'ornaments' metaphorically deprives the sixth line of its point. A plainer, if a more prosaic, interpretation lies to hand. The Epilogue means—or might mean—simply that (for reasons unknown) the wedding had been hurried forward before the bridegroom's presents arrived from England; that he had promised to make amends to his bride both for

the lack of these presents and for the hasty wedding; and has fulfilled both promises in this poem, which is at once an ornament above rubies and (in compensation for the shortness of time allowed for the wedding preparations) a monument to all time.

If the Epilogue means—or might mean[1]—no more than this, we have turned Mr Long's most formidable position, and can now lay siege to his weakest—the identification of Lady Carey with Charillis. 'Phyllis the faire is eldest of the three' (*Colin Clout*, 541): Lady Carey was the eldest of the three Spenser sisters; therefore, it should seem, Lady Carey is Phyllis. Mr Long is of course aware of this fact; he sees clearly how dangerous it is to his argument; and he tries hard to turn its point. Spenser, he thinks, may really have been mistaken as to the ages of the sisters; or he may have aimed a compliment at Lady Carey. Neither of these explanations commands one's assent. Would Spenser pay Lady Carey a rather vulgar compliment at her sister's expense? Or advertise his want of intimacy with a family that he was so proud to claim kinship with?

But if Lady Carey is *not* Charillis, the argument based on the comparative ardour of the dedication to *Muiopotmos*, and even of the dedicatory sonnet to the *Faerie Queene*, is seriously weakened.

There remains the *fact* of this dedicatory sonnet. The significance of that I admit. But no argument can be drawn from the *promise* which it contains; for precisely the same promise is made to Lady Strange in the dedication to the *Teares of the Muses*, and to Lady Compton in the dedication to *Prosopopoia*. (I may add that no such promise is made in the dedication to *Muiopotmos*; but this, as we shall see, admits of another explanation.)

I proceed to consider the two arguments by which Mr Long tries to push back the date of Spenser's marriage. The view that he had five children rests, so far as I know, upon no evidence more reliable than Ben Jonson's gossip about an infant that perished in the sack of Kilcolman, which is of a piece with the legend that Spenser died of starvation. If there be any evidence more substantial, we are still free to believe that Peregrine and Lawrence were twins. But this discussion threatens to lose seriousness.

Mr Long's second argument proves too much. For if Sylvanus was not a minor in 1603, his father must have been married by 1581. And

[1] 'Or might mean,' I say, for my argument requires no more. About the rhythm and the syntax of this Epilogue there hangs what Meredith would call 'a strong smell of something left out.'

this is impossible. For (1) the scene of the *Epithalamion* is laid at Kilcolman ('Ye Nymphes of Mulla,' St. 3), and Spenser did not reside there before 1588, probably not before 1589; (2) in *Colin Clout* (1591) Spenser is still faithful to his love for Rosalind; and (3)—which is quite conclusive—the opening of the *Epithalamion* proves it to be subsequent at least to the first instalment of the *Faerie Queene*, to *Daphnaida*, and to the *Ruines of Time*. Nor can we, after all, ignore (4) the 'written not long since' of Ponsonby. By these two sets of arguments the date of the wedding—or at least of the wedding-song—is pushed and pulled back towards 1594, and the synchronism of the real and the imaginary courtship is again on our hands.

Is there, besides this synchronism, any positive evidence that would lead us to identify the mistress of the *Amoretti* with the bride of the *Epithalamion*? There is some.

There are, first, some general correspondences, or echoes from the one poem to the other. *Epith.*, l. 14 'Helpe me mine owne loves prayses to resound' seems to echo Sonnet lxxx, 'Till then give leave to me, in pleasant mew To sport my muse, and sing my loves sweet praise'; while Sonnet xix, 7, 'That all the woods theyr ecchoes back rebounded' recalls the famous refrain of the *Epithalamion*.

These correspondences grow more numerous and striking as Spenser proceeds to descant on the appearance of his mistress. He notes the proud humility of her mien: compare *Amoretti*, xiii,

> In that proud port which her so goodly graceth,
> Whiles her faire face she reares up to the skie,
> And to the ground her eie-lids low embaseth,
> Most goodly temperature ye may descry;
> Myld humblesse, mixt with awfull majesty.
> For looking on the earth whence she was borne,
> Her minde remembreth her mortalitie,
> Whatso is fayrest shall to earth returne.
> But that same lofty countenance seemes to scorne
> Base thing, and thinke how she to heaven may clime;

with *Epithal.*, Stanza ix,

> Loe, where she comes along with portly pace,
> Lyke Phœbe from her chamber of the East,
> Arysing forth to run her mighty race,
> Clad all in white, that seemes a virgin best.
> . . . . . .
> Her modest eyes, abashed to behold
> So many gazers as on her do stare,
> Upon the lowly ground affixed are;
> Ne dare lift up her countenance too bold,
> But blush to heare her prayses sung so loud,
> So farre from being proud.

He dwells upon the charms of her person: compare *Amoretti,* xv,

> Ye tradefull Merchants, that with weary toyle,
> Do seeke most pretious things to make your gain, etc.

with *Epith.,* St. x,

> Tell me, ye merchants daughters, etc.

and upon the inward beauty of her character: compare the last two lines of the above-mentioned sonnet,

> But that which fairest is, but few behold,
> Her mind adornd with vertues manifold.

with the beginning of *Epith.,* xi,

> But if ye saw that which no eyes can see,
> The inward beauty of her lively spright, etc.

and the latter part of the same stanza,

> There dwels sweet love, and constant chastity,
> Unspotted fayth, and comely womanhood,
> Regard of honour, and mild modesty;
> There vertue raynes as Queene in royal throne,
> And giveth lawes alone,
> The which the base affections doe obay,
> And yeeld theyr services unto her will;
> Ne thought of thing uncomely ever may
> Thereto approach to tempt her mind to ill.

with *Amoretti,* lxxxiii,

> Let not one sparke of filthy lustfull fyre
> Breake out, that may her sacred peace molest;
> Ne one light glance of sensuall desyre
> Attempt to work her gentle mindes unrest:
> But pure affections bred in spotlesse brest,
> And modest thoughts breathd from wel-tempred sprites,
> Goe visit her in her chast bowre of rest,
> Accompanyde with angelick delightes.

These parallels are too numerous, too close, too individual, to be easily ignored; and to these may be added a comparison of *Amoretti,* lxiv with *Epith.,* St. x.

Some of the sonnets are very lover-like. It would be hard, I think, to parallel such sonnets as xv, lxiv, and lxxvi from any purely ideal sequence. And some of the later sonnets have a matter-of-fact note which is curiously convincing. After the third year has begun (Sonnet lxii) the course of true love begins to run smooth; the poet begins to descry the happy shore (lxiii); he kisses his lady's lips (lxiv)—she has yielded; in Sonnet lxv she fears to lose her liberty; and with the advent of Spring, in Sonnet lxx, he bids her 'her selfe soone ready make To

wayt on Love amongst his lovely crew'—to be getting ready, one would take it, for the wedding.

These arguments all point us back to the traditional view. Yet I am sensible of the weight of some, at least, of Mr Long's contentions. There is the dedicatory sonnet to the *Faerie Queene*; there is the ardent dedication to *Muiopotmos*; and if Charillis is not Lady Carey, the anagram on her name is an odd coincidence. And if, for reasons already shown, I cannot accept Mr Long's view as it stands, I find difficulties scarcely less serious in accepting the traditional view as it stands. (1) The lady of the *Amoretti* seems to be above the poet in station (see especially Sonnet lxv); of this there is no hint in the *Epithalamion*. True, the language of the *Amoretti* may on this point be merely conventional; in any case we cannot dogmatize until we know more about Elizabeth Boyle. (2) An attentive reader of the sonnets cannot but feel that they are in two different keys. Some, as I have said, are very lover-like; they sound like the natural expression of unaffected passion. And it is significant that it is precisely these sonnets that find verbal echoes in the *Epithalamion*. But between these outbursts there are stretches of comparatively tame country—occasional poems, one might call them, suggested by such unstaled incidents as the lady's smiling, or tearing up his verses, or sitting at her drawn-work, or watching him write her name upon the sand—poems in fact which might well find a place in a conventional sonnet-sequence. (3) The dates, too, present a difficulty. There are eighty-eight sonnets in all, spread over eighteen months. There are, in fact, fifty-eight to the unbroken year. Yet of the whole series no fewer than twenty fall after the second Easter. If the wedding took place on 11 June, this seems a disproportionate allowance. And (4) there is the singular ending, on which Mr Long so justly dwells. In Sonnet lxx, as we have seen, Spring has come, and is told to go to the bride and bid her make ready. Yet in Sonnet lxxxv, by which time, on the most lenient allowance, we must be hard upon the wedding, in Sonnet lxxxv we discover that some one has been slandering the poet to his mistress: in Sonnet lxxxvi he has been parted from her 'Many wearie dayes'; Sonnets lxxxvii and lxxxviii still bemoan this severance; and so the series ends. A strange ending, surely, to the record of a happy wooing; a strange prelude to the raptures of the *Epithalamion*.

Is the key to this riddle given in Sonnet lxxi? In that sonnet the poet tells how his lady in her drawn-work compares herself to the Bee, and him to 'the Spyder, that doth lurke In close awayt, to catch her

unaware.' What is this, in effect, but the theme of *Muiopotmos*? Is it fanciful to infer that the sight of Lady Carey at just such a piece of 'drawn-work' may in fact have inspired that poem? For *Muiopotmos*, unlike most of the pieces in the 1591 volume, was not an early poem. It is not so described in its dedication, as are *Virgil's Gnat* and *Prosopopoia*. It has a separate title-page, bearing date 1590. And—what has not, I think, been previously observed—it abounds in echoes from the *Faerie Queene*: ll. 28, 33 and 34, 86, 134, 165–6, 217, 356 all echo familiar lines of the *Faerie Queene*. I make no doubt that it was written in 1590.

Consider next the 'ideal time' covered by the *Amoretti*. The series begins just before a New Year, lasts through the whole year following and well into the year after that. Does not this tally closely with the actual duration of Spenser's stay in England from 1589 to 1591? He probably came to England late in November, for the *Faerie Queene* was licensed on 1 Dec. 1589. He left it, I believe in spite of the ambiguous date of *Daphnaida*, in the spring or summer of 1591.

It seems to me possible that during this stay Spenser *did* indite a series of complimentary sonnets to Lady Carey; that some misunderstanding arose between them just before his departure for Ireland, and that they afterwards had, or feigned, a quarrel[1]; or, more simply, that absence soon wore out his conventional devotion; that, in either case, he presently fell genuinely in love, and used up parts of this complimentary series in addresses to her whom Prior would have called his 'real flame.'

This hypothesis, I believe, explains all that is really difficult in the ordinary view of the sonnets—the difference of station, the difference of key, the length of the series after the second Easter, and above all the singular close. For the parting which Spenser bewails would thus belong to the original series, and would, in fact, be nothing more or less than his return to Ireland. And it conserves all that is really sound in Mr Long's argumentation[2]. It even permits us to believe that when Spenser wrote *Colin Clout* in 1591 he meant Charillis for Lady Carey, though when he published it in 1596 he juggled with the names and ages so as to transfer her praises to her sister.

[1] In two of the three copies known to me of the second (1596) edition of *F. Q.*, I—III this sonnet to Lady Carey was not reprinted. I mention the fact; but the huddled state of the appendicial matter in the 1596 edition forbids one to base any inference upon it.

[2] Mr Long himself glances, in one sentence, at the possibility of just such a *contaminatio*, but in the opposite sense; i.e., he thinks that sonnets originally written to Spenser's wife may have been incorporated in the complimentary set. But the dates seem to make this impossible.

Nor will all this seem incredible to those who know what men and poets are[1].

If I do not at present follow Mr Long into his discussion of *Faerie Queene*, VI, x, I have an excellent excuse. In a footnote to his admirable article Mr Long dangles before us an alluring promise of fuller discussion on the Sixth Book of the *Faerie Queene*. If he should do me the honour to read this paper, I would appeal to him to make good that promise forthwith. Few scholars in Britain or in America are so well qualified for a task, the neglect of which begins to be a discredit to English scholarship—the historical exegesis of the *Faerie Queene*.

J. C. SMITH.

NEWPORT, FIFE.

[1] Professor Grierson tells me that Lamartine similarly sent to his Elvire poems that had already done other duty, and that the Dutch poet Hooft in his wooing of Eleonora Hellermans made use (with a few changes) of poems which had been written for Susanna van Baerle.

THE TROUBLES OF A NORMAN SCRIBE.

DESCRIBING the Trinity manuscript (B. 14. 39) in his excellent edition of the *Proverbs of Alfred* (Oxford, 1907), Professor Skeat writes:

'we find at the foot of the first page of the poem, the following remarkable note:—

iy̆e	w	ant	iþorn
ȝ	p	⁊	þ

The meaning of this is obvious and significant. Before the scribe began to write out the poem, he made a note of the four new characters he had to employ....But he had by no means learnt his lesson aright. He uses ⁊ freely and correctly, for he had only to reproduce it; but he was quite unable to distinguish the A. S. *w* from the A. S. *th*, and frequently misuses them. But the strangest part of the story is that he could not remember the meaning of ȝ, and constantly uses it in place of *w*!'

If I have rightly apprehended Professor Skeat's meaning, I think that there are serious logical difficulties in accepting his account of the matter. The confusion of *wen* and *thorn* by a scribe unfamiliar with the language would, of course, be natural enough, for p, þ, and *y* (unless dotted) are indistinguishable in many early hands. But that anyone should write ȝ for p through unfamiliarity with the signs is surely inconceivable. The scribe, we are told, uses ⁊ correctly, 'for he had only to reproduce it.' But he presumably only had to reproduce ȝ: why then should he introduce it in place of another sign which it in no way resembles?

There is another difficulty in Professor Skeat's account. If the scribe needed a note to remind him of the value of þ, a gloss which contained the symbol itself would not help him. This puzzle made me turn to the manuscript, when I saw that the word above þ was

not 'iþorn,' as printed, but 'iȳorn.' I do not think this was a mere slip of the pen on the scribe's part, but that it rather represents as close a phonetic rendering as he could manage: in other words, that he was incapable of clearly differentiating between the values of þ and ȝ. He may have realized and even reproduced the difference in speech, but in writing the phonetic symbols at his command failed him. Regarding the prefixed *i*, Professor Skeat remarks that the scribe 'was unable to sound the initial *y* without prefixing the slight vowel-sound *i*.' I am not sure that I understand exactly what this means, for the consonantal sound always starts from the vowel position. The *i* I take to be merely a scribal device indicating that *y* has here the consonantal value, for this, so far as I can find, it never has in the text. As to the general significance of the note it is best to confess ignorance. Professor Skeat's view can certainly not be accepted as it stands, for þ and ȝ at least were far from being 'new characters' to the scribe. Some clue to the secret may perhaps be discovered when the manuscript is carefully studied as a whole.

Mr Macaulay has pointed out to me that if the scribe was unable to distinguish between *th* and consonantal *y*, it may account for the confusion between þ and ȝ which occurs in the manuscript. This is so, and it is possible that some of the instances did actually so arise. But we have to account for the fact that the substitution of ȝ for *w* (an error which would involve first a misreading of þ for p and then a confusion of ȝ with þ) is far commoner than that of ȝ for *th*. We shall find that there is a simple hypothesis which will explain all these confusions and others as well.

But first let us see exactly how the matter stands. The scribe made some attempt to distinguish between the forms of þ and p (so much is evident from his note) but he was not always successful, cases occurring in which it is difficult, apart from the context, to say which was intended. But, an undoubted þ also frequently occurs for *w*, that is by mistake for p. Whether an undoubted p ever occurs by mistake for þ is not so certain. Professor Skeat mentions two instances, but in one of these I think *w* is meant, while in the other the letter seems to me clearly þ. Nevertheless, I believe that just a few cases do occur: mere slips of the pen presumably. Professor Skeat notes at least nine instances of the use of þ in place of ȝ. He also notes six instances of the use of p for ȝ, but here I disagree: in every case the letter seems to me þ and not p. The error of ȝ for *th* (þ) is noted once; that of ȝ for *w* (p) six times. In these cases there is,

of course, no doubt as to the reading of the manuscript, and Professor Skeat's emendations seem unassailable, since in every case but one he can quote the authority of the Jesus manuscript for the change. Thus we find that þ is freely misused for *w* and frequently for ȝ, that ȝ is sometimes misused for *w* and once for *th*, but that p is (practically) never used except for *w*.

In order to account for these confusions all we have to assume is that the sign ȝ did not occur in the original from which our scribe copied. The value would, in that case, be represented by *y*. But for our scribe *y* was a vowel: in his text of the *Proverbs* it is always equivalent to *i*. Hence his desire to replace it by ȝ. But he evidently found that in practice þ, p, and *y* were indistinguishable, and having but a very imperfect knowledge of the language he made frequent errors in his endeavours to differentiate them. We never find him using *w* in place of þ or *y*, whence I infer that *w* already appeared in the original by the side of p. If this was so, much the commonest value of the puzzling symbol before him would be *th*: he would have to render it by þ much more frequently than by either p or ȝ. This explains why he often writes þ for the other letters, but seldom the other letters for þ. Indeed, he wrote þ so constantly for p that there were very few real cases of p left, and the fact that *w* occurred side by side with it apparently made the scribe reluctant to give this value to the sign at all. Thus he actually wrote ȝ more frequently than p, and we consequently find him substituting ȝ occasionally for p but only once for þ, while he replaces *y* (=ȝ) frequently by þ but never by p. Lastly we have p, which largely disappears before the encroachments of þ and ȝ, and is never used in the place of other letters, except very rarely, and probably unintentionally, for þ.

That there is in the Trinity manuscript not only confusion of þ and p, but of *y* as well, is evident apart from any consideration of ȝ. For there are at least two instances in which the scribe has written ẏ where he should have written p. If I am right in supposing that ȝ was replaced by *y* in the original manuscript (the source, that is, of the Trinity manuscript) it is probably a rather early instance of the substitution. But it would be by no means unique. The Trinity manuscript, it is allowed, presents a later redaction of the *Proverbs* than the Jesus manuscript, though the date of the two is about the same. This suggests that the source of the former was probably little, if at all, older than the latter. But the Jesus manuscript has *y* throughout, and so has the collection of Kentish Sermons preserved in MS. Laud

471, which again is ascribed to about the same period, namely 1250. What might perhaps cause surprise is that the *y* should have been left undotted at this date, but that it was so seems clearly proved by the cases of confusion with p mentioned above. Another point which might be thought improbable is that a scribe who was so modern as to write *y* for ȝ should ever have written p at all, as the scribe of the original of the Trinity manuscript evidently did not infrequently. I imagine, however, that he was copying from an earlier manuscript which had p and ȝ consistently, and he may very likely have left a number of p's standing through inadvertence, just as, for aught we know, he may have left some ȝ's.

W. W. Greg.

Cambridge.

NOTES ON 'BEOWULF.'

l. 31. MS. *þenden wordum weold wine scyldinga leof landfruma lange ahte.* The absence of an object for *ahte* is not a serious difficulty, as *ahte* merely repeats *weold,* and its object *word* is understood. It is just possible, however, that the writer may have thought he had written *worda geweald* in l. 30; cf. l. 79 *his wordes geweald wide hæfde.* In any case, there is no need to suppose, with Holthausen, a lacuna.

l. 204. The MS. reading *hæl gesceawedon* is generally translated 'looked for prosperity,' or else 'observed (or looked for) an omen.' For the latter rendering the O.H.G. *heil scouwon* is adduced. But *hæl(o)* has nowhere else the sense of 'omen,' nor can *sceawedon* mean 'looked for.' I would suggest *hæl geeawedon,* 'gave him a farewell greeting.' In ll. 653, 1217 *hæl(o)* means 'greeting'; in l. 2418 it means 'farewell.' The usual expression is *hæl(o) abeodan*; thus l. 653 *him hæl abead,* l. 2418 *hælo abead.* For *geeawed* with the sense of *aboden* cf. l. 1194 *wunden gold estum geeawed.*

ll. 223, 224. MS. *þa wæs sund liden eoletes æt ende. Liden* cannot be right, as *liðan* is intransitive. *Eoletes* is not found elsewhere. We might read *þa wæs sund lides ealles æt ende* 'then was the voyage of the bark quite at an end.' Is it too fanciful to regard *eoletes* as having arisen from *eal⁊es* (*et*) in the MS. from which our text was copied, the *et* being a Latin gloss of a second *l* written like the abbreviation for *and*? In this connection see note on ll. 2333—2335.

ll. 413—414. MS. *siððan æfenleoht under heofenes hador beholen weorþeð.* The difficulty is *hador,* which is not used as an adjective, meaning 'bright,' 'clear.' The passage might be emended by reading *hador under heofene.*

l. 567. MS. *þæt syðþan na ymb brontne ford brimliðende lade ne letton. Bront* 'lofty' is almost always used of a ship (see Bosworth-Toller). Here it is used absolutely, = 'ship.' Reading *forð* for *ford* we

translate 'so that henceforward (syðþan forð) they did not around the ship hinder seafarers from their course.'

l. 985. MS. *steda nægla gehwylc.* Read *stiðnægla* 'strong or sharp nails'; cf. Beow. l. 1533 *stið ond stylecg* used of a sword; also *Be Domes Dæge*, l. 179 *mid stiðum sticelum.*

l. 991. MS. *ða wæs haten hreþe heort innan weard folmum gefrætwod.* I would read *ða wæs hat on hreþre; Heorot innan wearð folmum gefrætwod*; translate 'then was there fervour in their hearts; Heorot was adorned inside with hands.' *Hat* as adjective frequently means 'fervid' as applied to feelings; it also occurs as a substantive. Here it may be taken as either adjective or substantive. Cf. l. 2328 *hreow on hreðre.* Or else read *haton* (= *hatum*) *hreþre H. innanweard.*

ll. 1134, 1135. MS. *oþðæt oþer com gear in geardas swa nu gyt deð þa ðe syngales sele bewitiað.* If for *þa* we read *þam* we may translate 'until a second year came to dwellings (i.e., to men), as it (the year) still does (come) to those who are continually watching the seasons.' *Sele* = *sæle.*

l. 1161. MS. *beorhtode bencsweg. Beorhtode* is generally rendered 'sounded clearly,' but there is no other instance of such a meaning for *beorhtian* (though cf. *heaðotorht*, l. 2553). By reading *beorhtmode* we get the required meaning. The form *beorhtm* = W.S. *breahtm, bearhtm* 'a noise,' occurs in *Elene*, l. 205; the verb *breahtmian* 'to make a noise' is quoted in Bosworth-Toller from a gloss.

l. 2029. MS. *oft seldan hwær æfter leodhryre lytle hwile bongar bugeð.* I would read *oft selð* (= *sælð*) *onhwearf æfter leodhryre; lytle hwile bongar bugeð* and translate 'often has fortune changed after the fall of a prince; but a little time does the murderous spear rest.'

ll. 2333—2335. MS. *hæfde ligdraca leoda fæsten ealond utan eorðweard ðone gledum forgrunden.* It seems to me that *eorðweard* can hardly be the right word. Read *eall utanweard, eorðweall ðone gledum forgrunden* and translate 'the fiery dragon had destroyed the people's fortress utterly from the outside, (had destroyed) the earthwall with flames.' Such transpositions by scribes are common. Possibly *ealond* arose from the second *l* of *eall* being written below the level of the first and mistaken for the abbreviation for *and.*

l. 2475. MS. (omitting intervening words) *þa wæs...herenið hearda syððan hreðel swealt oððe him ongenðeowes eaferan wæran frome fyrdhwate.* In this passage *oððe* seems out of place; we may replace it with *seoððan* (or the weak form *seoðða*) and put a semicolon after *hearda. Syððan* and *seoððan* are correlatives.

l. 2525. MS. *nelle ic beorges weard oferfleon fotes trem.* It is better to omit *ofer*. Cf. *Battle of Maldon*, l. 247 *fleon fotes trym.*

ll. 2558, 2559. MS. *hruse dynede biorn under beorge.* A full stop is usually put after *dynede* and *biorn* is translated 'the warrior.' But we may put a comma after *dynede*, a semicolon after *beorge* and translate 'the earth resounded and burned under the hill.' For *beorn* = *born* 'burned' cf. l. 1880 *beorn wiþ blode.*

l. 2659. MS. *urum sceal sweord ond helm byrne ond byrdu scrud bam gemœne.* The use of *urum bam* as equivalent to *unc* is not idiomatic. I would suggest *huru* for *urum* and translate 'surely sword and helmet, corslet and armour must be common to both' (Beowulf and the Geatish warriors), i.e., both parties must share in the conflict.

l. 2766. MS. *sinc eaðe mœg gold on grund*[*e*] *gumcynnes gehwone ofer higian.* For *ofer higian* we might read *oferhiwian. Hīwian* means 'to assume a false appearance,' 'to feign'; so that *oferhiwian* might well mean 'deceive.' The general sense of the passage is that hidden treasure will in the long run frustrate the intention of him who hides it. A possible though not very convincing alternative would be *ofer hige hean* (taking *hean* as a dissyllable) 'exalt above his (usual) mind,' 'unduly exalt.'

l. 2854. MS. *wehte hyne wœtre.* For *wehte* should we read *wette* (= *wǣtte*) 'wetted'?

W. J. Sedgefield.

Manchester.

OLD SCANDINAVIAN PERSONAL NAMES IN ENGLAND.

THE study of English place and personal names has been pursued in this country and on the continent with no little vigour during the last few years. Professor Skeat has written monographs on the place names of no less than four English counties, and is I believe now at work on those of a fifth; Mr Duignan has dealt with the place names of two more counties, Dr Moorman of Leeds has in preparation a work on Yorkshire place names. In Germany, Dr Middendorff has written a useful book on the elements of O.E. place names, and, as recently as last year, there appeared the original and suggestive work of Zacchrisson of Lund, on the influence of Norman-French on English place names. In the domain of family and personal names, we have Searle's *Onomasticon*, the Index to the Birch Chartulary, the copious and laborious compilation of Bardsley, and Mr Baring-Gould's book which only appeared a few months ago, and now we have Professor Björkman's book on Scandinavian personal names in England during the Old and early Middle English period[1], which will be exceedingly welcome to students in more than one field of research. We have here for the first time a systematic attempt to collect together from late O.E. and early M.E. sources, the Scandinavian personal names which are found in the documents of these periods.

Those who know Professor Björkman's earlier volumes on the Scandinavian Loan Words in Middle English will not be surprised to learn that his recent work is carefully and intelligently performed. If he has not searched all the early English documents, Rolls, Charters and Calendars, in which Scandinavian names might be expected to occur, he has ransacked such important documents as *Doomsday Book*, the *Hundred Rolls*, *Pipe Rolls*, *Rotuli de oblatis et finibus*, the *Hyde Register*, *Liber Vitæ*, Kemble's *Codex Diplomaticus*, Birch's *Cartu-*

[1] *Nordische Personennamen in England in alt- und frühmittelenglischer Zeit*, von Erik Björkman. Halle, Niemeyer. 1910.

larium, and several more. He has arranged the names alphabetically, under a typical spelling, and has given the various forms of each which he has found with chapter and verse. He has also given a few examples of English place names in which the Scandinavian personal names occur—these appear to be chiefly from Doomsday. The true Norse forms of the names, as they occur in Norse documents, are also given, or when these fail, the reconstructed forms. The aim and methods of the work are, as the author says, purely linguistic or philological, and he has very wisely left historians to do their own business, and to make what use they please of the material which he supplies. The vital problem of such an investigation as this, namely to say just which names are unquestionably Norse, is one which only a scholar trained in modern philological learning can settle satisfactorily, and there are some names whose origin the subtlest known linguistic tests leave undecided.

Professor Björkman devotes about thirty pages at the end of his volume to considering the distinguishing tests between the Norse and English origin of names. The linguistic criteria, which are practically those enumerated in the author's earlier book, appear to me to be the only really convincing tests. Curiously enough Björkman himself considers as more important tests than the phonological those which 'in den Verschiedenheiten in der Bildungsart der Personennamen der Engländer und der Skandinavier begründet sind.' He admits the imperfect state of our knowledge of Germanic names, but lays great stress upon the fondness of the old Norsemen for nicknames—often of an uncomplimentary and even an abusive character. Personally, while I do not of course deny this feature in Norse nomenclature, nor yet that these nicknames often became permanent baptismal names, I doubt very much whether this characteristic is confined to the Norse, and am inclined to believe that if we knew more about O.E. and other old Germanic personal names, and had a thorough analysis according to the nature and origin of all those which are preserved, we should find that, among the English at least, the number of names which were nicknames in origin was considerable.

It is with Norse names as with Norse words. There are some found in this country which are quite unequivocally Norse, either from their form alone, or from this combined with the fact that, so far as our information goes, the equivalent native name was not in use among the English. The name *Āskel* or *Āsketil(l)* is a case in point. The first syllable would be *Ōs-* in O.E., and the second element *-ketill* is believed never to occur in a genuine O.E. name.

Another class of names are hybrids, that is to say one element is Norse in form, the other English. Such is *Ulfhere* which in pure O.E. is *Wulfhere*, and in pure O. Norse *Ulvar*, or *Wulfstain* where the first element is O.E. and the second Norse. The genuine O.E. form of this name is *Wulfstān*. Again, such a M.E. form as *Uluiet* presupposes an earlier *Ulfgēat* which in the first element shows the typical O. Norse loss of *w* before a rounded vowel, but in the second has a pure O.E. diphthong corresponding to Germanic *au* which remains in O.N. The O.E. form of this name is *Wulfgēat* while the O.N. would be **Ulfgautr*. The former would give M.E. **Wulviet* or **Wulvet*, the latter **Ulgot*. A third class of O.N. names are those which have been as it were 'translated' into O.E. and here the ground is often very ticklish for the investigator. A large number of names are common to all Germanic peoples, and appear in each language, modified according to the phonetic laws of that language. When a name of which a Norse form is known to exist occurs in a purely O.E. form, it is a question open to discussion whether each of the forms is native to England and Norway respectively, being developed out of a common ancestral type, or whether one language has borrowed the name from the other, and so altered its form that its elements appear in the purely native form of the language into which it has been borrowed. O.E. has a name *Gūþhere* which presupposes an earlier **Gunþharja-*. This Germanic type would develop in O.N. into *Gunnar*, in which form it is actually found, and in O.H.G. into *Gunther*, which form also is well known in that tongue. In this case it is quite unnecessary to assume any but the obvious explanation that each type has normally developed out of a common original. At any rate if one language borrowed from another at all, it was at such an early date that the primitive form of the word was practically unaltered, so that it underwent the ordinary phonetic changes of an inherited word. On the other hand such a name as *Ōsċytel*, irreproachable as an O.E. name in form, is rightly claimed as a mere adaptation of the Norse *Āsketil*, because from what we know of O.E. names we are led to believe that this name, although common among the Norse, was not a name originally possessed by our ancestors, and in the earliest cases of its occurrence in English documents, it is applied not to Englishmen but to Scandinavians (Björkman, p. 19). But, again, there is absolutely no reason to assume that the unexceptionable O.E. *Hrōþwulf* is derived from an early O.N. form before this had passed into the later *Hrōlfr*. It may have been the case, but it cannot be proved, any more than it can be proved that the Norse

name was borrowed at an early period from the English. It is surely safer when such a form as M.E. *Roðulf* is found to assume that it is normally descended from an O.E. form, and that that form was native, and on the other hand that the M.E. type *Rolf*, *Roulf* etc. is the descendant of the O.N. cognate. As a matter of fact it is quite possible that even M.E. *Roulf* might represent an O.E. *Hrōþulf* with loss of þ between vowels. before an unstressed syllable. Lastly there are names like *Crōc* or *Krōk(r)* whose form throws no light whatever which helps us to decide whether it is English or Norse. It would be the same in both languages, and was probably used by both peoples as a name. The name *Crooks* is the descendant of this name, and it occurs also in many place names—e.g., *Croxteth*, *Croxby* etc. Even such names as *Āsmund*, clearly distinguished from the O.E. form *Ōsmund* by its *ā* in the O.E. period, are often indistinguishable from the English form in M.E. spelling, since this *ā* was rounded to *ō* in M.E. in the South and Midlands. Thus a M.E. spelling *Osmund* may imply either an O.E. *Ōsmund* or an O.N. *Āsmund*. It is true that the *ō* would be differently pronounced according to whether it represented earlier *ō* or *ā*, but no difference is made in the spelling.

It is clear that all these problems are the business of the philologist alone, and it is only by having these and other similar problems which confront the student of place and personal names solved, according to the best available expert linguistic method, that the antiquary and the historian will get reliable material to work from, upon which they may base their theories of settlements, and race mixture, race distribution and national genius and the rest.

The study of English names is as yet only in its infancy, and Professor Björkman has made a notable contribution to it. But an enormous amount still remains to be done in every direction. Our vast store of ancient records of all sorts is barely skimmed by Björkman, and there is material enough to keep an army of investigators busy in collecting Scandinavian personal names alone. Then there are the names of this origin in English place names to be identified and tabulated. It is probable that this latter source would yield material, if we had a complete and manageable index of all the early forms, from which we might decide the approximate date at which this or that settler who gave his name as a permanent designation of a dwelling or a hill, lived, at any rate to which of the various 'Danish' invasions he belonged. This fact, which might be established from linguistic evidence, would be of prime importance to historians.

I should be very sorry if any expression I have used with regard to Professor Björkman's sources were interpreted to mean disparagement of his labours which are solid and praiseworthy. All English students will render a tribute of admiration to the foreign scholar, who, having to contend with many difficulties, and being doubtless often deprived of access to sources which he would fain have used, has yet given us so much. But the magnitude of the task of providing material for an adequate study of English names should spur on more English labourers to enter this field of research, a hope which Björkman himself expresses with regard to that part of the subject in which his own is pioneer work.

In the course of the last three or four years Dr Hirst of the University of Liverpool and myself have been collecting materials for a work on the Place Names of Lancashire which I hope may appear during the current year.

Had I had Professor Björkman's book in my hands during the last few years I should have been saved a very large amount of labour in establishing the existence of certain Scandinavian personal names, and tracing their use in this country. This labour however I undertook, and I now append two lists of such of these names as I have identified in Lancashire place names. List A contains names mentioned and discussed in Professor Björkman's lists. List B below, which is very much shorter, contains a few names which he does not mention so far as I can see. In most cases I have given enough early forms of each name to make it quite clear that the particular personal name under discussion actually did form the first element. I have in all cases given the date of the document from which the forms are taken.

A.

Scandinavian Pers. Names mentioned by Björkman which occur in Lancashire Place Names.

Norse Name	Mod. Lancs. Pl. N.	Early Forms
Auðgrīmr	*Orrell* (Wigan)	*Otegrimele*, Doomsday Book.
Agmundr	*Amounderness*	*Agemundernesse*, D. B.
Anleifr (O.E. form *Anlaf*)	*Anglezarke*	1224, *Anlauesargh*, Lanc. Fines, I, p. 45.
Arngeir (O.E. **Arngār*)	*Angerby*	*Angoreby*, Testa de Nevil, p. 409.
Arnketill Arnkill, etc.	*Artlethorn* *Artlebeck*	1228, *Arkillesthorn*, L. F. I, p. 58.
Arnulfr	*Arnside*	1208, *Arnuluesheued*, L. F. I, p. 39.

Norse Name	Mod. Lancs. Pl. N.	Early Forms
Āsmundr	*Osmotherley*	1440, *Asmunderlaw*, G. de, Furness, Ch. II, p. 351. 1300, *Osmunderlaw*, W. de, Furn. Ch. II, p. 381. [The forms with *Osmunder-* as late as 1667, cp. Richmond, Wills, p. 247. *Osmother-* begins 1588 Rich. Wills, p. 163. Is there confusion with the name *Asmōþ*?]
Coupman Kaupmaðr	*Capernwray*	*Coupmanwra*, 1263–72, Lancs. Ch. 27.
Kati	*Catterall*	*Catrehala*, D.B.; 1244, *Katirhale*, Lanc. Inq. p. 159.
Kollr	*Cowford* Colton	*Colleforthe*, 11 Edw. III. Forest Peramb. cit. Lanc. P. Roll, p. 425.
Gunnulfr	*Gunnell's Moors*	1328, *Gonolfemores*, Whalley, Ch. p. 268. 1329, *Gunnolvemores*, Testa de Nevil, p. 403.
Grimketill Grimkel	*Cringlebarrow Wood*	No early forms, but initial *C* for *G*, common in Lancs. Pl. Ns. Cp. also forms *Grinkel* (O.N. form); *Gringeleia*, Northants, D.B.; *Gryngeley*, 2 Edw. I, Plac. Abbrev. p. 187. Thus the chain of forms from *Grimkel* to *Cringle* is complete.
Krōkr	*Croxteth* *Croston*	1257, *Crocstad*, L. Inq. p. 210. 1094, *Croston*, Lanc. Ch. 9; but *Croxton*, T. de N. 408, 408 b, and *Croxtun*, Furn. Ch. 203, 1401.
Finn	*Finsthwaite*	1337, *Finnesthwait*, Furn. Ch. p. 173.
Forna, etc.	*Formby*	1227, *Forneby*, Cal. Rotl. Ch. p. 40. Note the curious form *Fornethby*, Cal. Inq. P.M. I, p. 137, 1297.
Gamall	*Gambleside*	
Geirr	*Garstang*	1204–5, *Geirstan*, Lanc. P. Roll, 51, p. 192.
Gaukr	*Gauxholm* *Gawthorp* from **Gaukthorp*?	1521, *Gawkeholme*, Ducatus Lancastr. I, p. 23.
Grīmr or Grimm	*Grimsargh*	D. B. *Grimesarge*. 1189, *Grimesherh(am)*, Ch. I, Ser. XXI, L. P. R. p. 437.
	Grimshaw	1284, *Grymeschawe*, Lanc. Assize Rolls, p. 181. 1311, *Grimeschagh* etc., Lanc. Inq. 12. [These forms appear to disprove Bardsley's view, accepted by Björkman, p. 51, that *Grimshaw* = *Grimes haga*.]
	Greystonley	1200–1, *Grimestonlyd*, L. P. R. 47, p. 131.
Grīss	*Grizedale*	1337, *Grisedale*, Furn. Ch. 173.
	Grisehead	1259, *Griseheuet*, L. Inq. p. 224.
Gunnhild	*Gunnell's Fold*	1258, *Gunnildisford*, L. Inq. p. 214. The Pers. N. *Gunnyld* occurs in 1332 in an Exchequer Lay Subsidy, Lanc. and Chesh. Misc. II, p. 93.
Gunnar	*Gunner's How* or *Gummer's How*. *Gunnerthwaite*	
Haukr	*Hawkshead*	1198–1200, *Hovkesete*, Ch. IV, Ser. XII, L. P. R. p. 363. 1208, *Howkeset*, Furn. Ch. p. 439.
	Hawkley	1332, *Haukeslegh*, Lanc. and Chesh. Misc. II, p. 18.

Hawkshaw is doubtful since the form *Hauekesheghe* occurs L. A. R. p. 259, 1218–19, though other 13th century examples have *Haukes-*. I do not agree with B.'s remark, p. 66, note, that *Hafoc* is never used in O.E. as a personal name. In *Hafoceshlǣw*, C. D. IV, p. 93, it is almost certainly a personal name.

Norse Name	Mod. Lancs. Pl. N.	Early Forms
Knūtr	*Knothill*	12th century ?, *Cnouthull*, Whall. Ch. p. 149.
Muli	*Mowbrick*	1287, *Molebreke*, Lanc. Inq. p. 265. *Moulebreke*, L. F. II, p. 78.
Ormr	*Ormerod* *Ormskirk* *Ormeston*	
Osulfr	Mod. forms lost	but cp. *Osolvescroft*, Ch. I, Ser. XVII, in Lanc. P. Roll, p. 405. *Osuelustache*, Ch. VI, Ser. II, L. P. R. p. 329, 1190–1212.
Olfr	*Owthwaite*	1202, *Ulvesthweit*, L. F. I, p. 12.
Rafn	**Ravenmeols* (now lost) *Ravenswinder*	1246, *Ravenesmeles*, L. F. I, p. 102.
Rauðr	Upper *Rawcliff*	1212, *Routheclif*, Gt. Inq. L. Inq. p. 37. *Upperoutheclif*, L. F. II, p. 26. [The first element here is clearly Scand., but it may be merely the adj. 'red' and not a Pers. N.]
Rōskinn[1]	*Rossendale*	*Roscyndale*, L. F. II, p. 3, 1294. *Roscindale*, De Lac. Comp. p. 7, 1305.
Hrōðulfr	*Roddlesworth*	1159–64, *Rodtholfeswrth*, Ch. I, Ser. XIV, L. P. R. p. 374.

[There is really no reason except conjecture for assuming a Norse origin for this name. It is pure English in form and occurs very early in English documents quite apart from Beowulf. The Norse form is *Hrōlfr* (Björkman, p. 113), and from this no doubt the Norman *Raulf*, *Roulf*, etc., and English *Ralph* are derived. The Oxfordshire *Rousham*, as appears from the investigations of Mr H. Alexander of the University of Liverpool, has such old forms as *Rolvesham*, *Rovesham* from this Norman type.]

Sigwarð	*Silverdale*	1241, *Siuerdelege* (bis), L. F. I, p. 82.
Skalli	*Scaleber*	1202, *Scaleberge*, L. F. I, p. 151.
Snell		1294, *Snelleshowe*, De Lacy, Comp. p. 14.
Steinn	*Stainall*	1176, *Steinola*, L. P. R. 23, p. 35. 1249, *Staynole*, L. Inq. p. 172.
	Stainton	1256, *Steynton*, L. F. I, p. 124.
Styrr	*Stirzaker*	1332, *Steresacre*, Lanc. and Chesh. Misc. II, p. 94. 1342, *Stiresacre*, L. F. II, p. 114.
	Steerspool	1235, *Styrespol*, L. F. I, p. 59.
Swegen (*Sveinn*)	*Swainshead*	D. B. *Suenesat.*
Toki	*Toxteth*	D. B. (*S*)*tochestede*; 1212, *Tokestath*, Gt. Inq. L. Inq. p. 14.
	Tockholes	1285, *Tokholes*, Whall. Ch. p. 111.
Þorbrandr	*Thorburnshead*	13th century. *Thorebrandesheved*, Lanc. Ch. 19 (5 times).
Þorun, Þurun (Engl. form *Thoran*)	*Thornton*	D. B. *Torentun.* 1245, *Thorenton*, L. F. I, p. 92. 1258, *Thorinton*, L. F. I, p. 103.
Þorfinn	*Thorpinlees*	cp. 1228, *Thorpincoles*, Whall. Ch. 371.
Þorelfr	*Threlfall*	D. B. *Trelefelt*, show confusion with *feld* in the 2nd element. The name means *Þorelf's halh.*

[1] Variant of *Rōskil*, etc., with interchange of suffix *-īnus* for *-illus*, as in *Asketil*, *Asketin*, *Askil*, *Askin*; cp. Björkman, pp. 17–19.

Norse Name	Mod. Lancs. Pl. N.	Early Forms
Þursteinn	*Thurstan Water*	1196, *Thurstaine water*, L. F. I, 4 and 5 (4 times). 1154–63, *Turstiniwatra*, Ch. IX, Ser. IV, L. P. R. p. 311.
Þoraldr	*Torrisholm*	1205–6, *Turoldesholme*, L. P. R. 52, p. 205. 1206, *Thoraldesholme*, Lanc. Ch. 385.
	(?) *Tarlescough* (?)	1189–96, *Tharlescogh*, Ch. I, Ser. XI, L. P. R. p. 350.
Þorulfr	*Torver*	1202, *Thorwerghe*, L. F. I, p. 17 (= *Þorulf hærh*). 1246, *Thorfergh*, L. F. I, p. 97.
Þōrr or **Þōra** (?)	*Turton*	1257, *Thurton*, Cal. Ch. Rolls, I, p. 474.
	Torbock	1242, *Thorboc*, Scut. of Gasc. L. Inq. p. 148. 1252, *Thorebok*, Lanc. Ch. 34.
Valþjōfr (Engl. form *Walþeof*)	*Walthew* House (Wigan).	I have no old forms of this Pl. N. *Waltheef* and the Latinised *Waldevius* occur constantly in Lancs. documents in 12th century. The name *Walthew* survives down to the present day in Lancs.
Ulfhere	*Ulverston*	1230, *Ulveston*, Cl. Rolls, III, p. 34. 1266, *Ulvreston*, Cal. Rot. Ch. p. 94. 1302, *Ulvereston*, L. F. I, p. 99. It is curious that the earliest forms are spelt as that of 1230 above. After 1266 all my forms are spelt *Ulvere-* etc.

The name Ulfhere is of course a hybrid—Norse as regards the first element, with loss of *v* before *u*, and English as regards the second element.

B.

Scandinavian Pers. Names not referred to by Björkman, which occur in Lancs. Place Names.

Ainulfr	*Ainsdale*	D. B. *Einuluesdale.*
Einulfr		1190–1206, *Aynuluisdale*, Cockersand Ch. p. 568.
Gunnbjorg	*Cumeralgh*	1292, *Gumberhalgh*, Plac. Q. Warr. p. 375.
Garðr	*Garswood*	1479, *Gartiswoode*, L. F. III, p. 137.
	Garscow	1220–46, *Garthschoh*, cit. Farrer, L. P. R. p. 360, fr. Ch. of Will. of Lancaster.
Ingulfr	*Inglebreck*	1236–56, *Ingelbrek*, Lanc. Ch. 195.
	Inglehead	1332, *Ingolhed*, Lanc. and Chesh. Misc. II, p. 67.
	Inglewhite (=**Ingulvesþweit*).	
	Inglewood	
Yrr	*Ireby*	D. B. *Irebi.*
	Ireleth	1292, *Irelith*, Furn. Ch. 634.
***Kelfgrimm**	*Kellamergh*	1200 *Kelfgrimeshereg*, L. P. R. 47, p. 132.

I have never identified this Pers. N. satisfactorily. It cannot be Colgrim (cit. Björkman). Can it be for **Kjölfgrim-* from earlier *Þjöðulf-* ? cp. Rygh, Norske Gaardn. I, p. 269.

Hāvarðr	*Haverthwaite*	1337, *Haverthwait*, Furn. Ch. p. 173. 1584, *Harderthat*, Rich. Wills, p. 226. The first element of this name is of course capable of a different explanation, but the above is to me the most probable.

Henry Cecil Wyld.

Liverpool.

TWO UNPUBLISHED MIDDLE HIGH GERMAN POEMS.

'Die vunfzehen zeichen' and 'Wie Got das jungst Gericht besitzen sol.'[1]

The legend of the fifteen signs, which were to announce the advent of the day of judgment, arose in the course of the centuries. Originating with the apocryphal book of *Esdra* the tradition gradually developed until it assumed the form we find in Beda Venerabilis, who seems to be the first to mention the number fifteen and to allot a separate sign to each of the fifteen days. In most medieval texts St Jerome is given as the authority for the legend; he, we are told, was the first to discover the signs in the *Annales Hebraeorum*. No such passage, however, is to be found in his works[2], and Bede, who is the first to quote St Jerome, must either have made use of a version of the *Annales* now no longer extant, or else, what is more probable, the legend must have arisen at a time when St Jerome had become an authority on matters ecclesiastical (i.e., after the year 400), and was thus made responsible for its invention[3].

[1] The following are among the more important works from the bibliography of the subject: Nölle, *Die Legende von den fünfzehn Zeichen vor dem jüngsten Gericht* in *P.B.B.* VI, 413, supplemented and rectified by Reuschel in his dissertation, *Untersuchungen zu den deutschen Weltgerichtsdichtungen des* XI. *bis* XV. *Jhs.*, Chemnitz, 1895, and in his larger work, *Die deutschen Weltgerichtsspiele des Mittelalters und der Reformationszeit, Sammlung Teutonia*, 1906. Cf. also Grau, *Quellen und Verwandtschaften der älteren germanischen Darstellungen des jüngsten Gerichts*, in *Studien zur englischen Philologie*, XXXI, Halle, 1908 (especially pp. 261 ff.); Klee, *Das mittelhochdeutsche Spiel vom jüngsten Tage* (Marburg Dissertation), 1906; Wadstein, *Die eschatologische Ideengruppe*, Leipzig, 1896, especially part I A, 'Weltende und Weltgericht.'

[2] Cf. Nölle, *l.c.*, p. 419 and the note in Hoffmann's *Fundgruben*, II, p. 127. Heinrich von Hesler in his *Apocalypse* (edited by Helm, *Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters*, VIII, 1907), 19832 seq. makes the following interesting remarks on the sources of the 'fifteen signs': 'Ouch tar ichz nicht schriben / Durch gelougenen veichen / Die vumfzen Gotes zeichen, / Die gnuc sagen sie sin war; / Sint aber ich sie nicht entar / Under andern minen meren / Mit warer schrift beweren, / Wen ich ir han nicht war gelesen, / Des laz ich gar die rede wesen.'

[3] See Grau, *l.c.*, p. 273.

Nölle, in his article in the *P.B.B.*, has divided the various versions of the legend into several groups, according to the sequence in which the signs follow one another. According to his division the present poem (I) belongs to Type II and thus agrees with the version of Pseudo-Beda 'De quindecim signis,' with the single deviation that the order of signs 13 and 14 is reversed[1]. This is in itself noteworthy as being the only example of a German poem which follows this type[2], most of the others following the version given by Petrus Comestor in his *Historia Evangelica*, or Type III according to Nölle's notation[3]. It is clear from a comparison with the Latin original that the author followed his source almost word for word. For convenience' sake I have subjoined the Latin in a foot-note, making use, however, of the amended text as revised by Grau (*l.c.*, p. 264 ff.)[4].

When we come to examine the sources of the longer poem on the Last Judgment (II) we are beset with difficulties on every side. The two treatises usually quoted as sources for eschatologic poems are the *Libellus de Antichristo*[5] and the *Elucidarium* of the so-called Honorius Augustodunensis[6]. The first need not be taken into consideration at all, for the poem contains no mention of the Antichrist. Whether, on the other hand, the author was familiar with the *Elucidarium* and drew on it for his poem must remain doubtful, for the passages I quote from this work in the commentary are, after all, little more than parallels. The matter seems to me to stand as follows: the basis of the poem is a summary of the more or less detailed references to the last judgment in Holy Scripture[7]. On this foundation the author then built up his poem with all kinds of embellishments, derived partly from the popular views current in his day, and partly from the traditional learning of the schoolmen[8]. I must at least confess

[1] See Grau, *l.c.*, p. 266.

[2] The sermon in Leyser, *Altdeutsche Predigten*, p. 61, and the Frisian *Asega* book both follow Type II. Cf. also Grau, *l.c.*, p. 273 A.

[3] Thus Grieshaber, *Deutsche Predigten*, p. 152 (word for word), as Reuschel has already noted; thus, too, the two versions printed by Bartsch-Jeitteles in *Germania*, XXIX, 402.

[4] Amongst the MSS. of Freiherr August von Arnswaldt in Hanover there are two further low German versions of the legend, to which Dr Reuschel draws my attention. Cf. A. Reifferscheid, *Jahrb. d. Ver. f. nd. Sprachforschung*, 1883, IX (1884). For English versions cf. *The Chester Mysteries*, ed. by T. Wright, Vol. II, pp. 147 and 219.

[5] Either Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* tom. 101, 1298 or in the edition by Ernst Sackur, *Sybillinische Texte und Forschungen*, Halle, 1898, p. 97.

[6] Migne, 172, 1164 ff.

[7] The biblical passages have been collected by Wadstein, *l.c.*, and by Voss, *Das jüngste Gericht in der bildenden Kunst des frühen Mittelalters*, Leipzig, 1884. Cf., too, the title of Hans Sachs' play: 'Tragedia mit 34 Personen, des jüngsten Gerichts, *aus der Schrift überall zusammengezogen*,' Stuttg. Lit. Ver. CXXXVI, pp. 400—450.

[8] Klee (*l.c.*, p. 33) exposes similar views with regard to the sources of the 'mittelhochdeutsches Spiel.' Heinrich von Hesler affirms that he has drawn on many sources for his

my inability to lay my hand upon any one single Latin treatise as the source of the poem.

We have but to glance at the index of Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, tom. CCXX, pp. 291—307 ('de iudicio universali et ultimo') to realise how strong the tradition was in those days. It is a well-known fact, that during the whole of the middle ages the second coming of the Son of Man was thought to be imminent. The fear of doomsday has always been present among the lower classes, not only during medieval times but even down to the present day[1]. The date of the awful event was continually being fixed, and it will be remembered how the year 1000 was especially feared on this account[2].

The story of the last judgment permeated all medieval art and literature. Painters and workers in the plastic arts drew much of their inspiration from the subject[3]. We frequently find judgment scenes on the pediments of church porches[4], on pulpits, lecterns, tombs[5] and even on church utensils[6], and pictures on the subject are legion.

The last judgment lends itself particularly well to dramatic representation and was in fact one of the most popular dramatic subjects of the middle ages[7]. It is but natural that the vividness and dramatic qualities of the story should have appealed strongly to the playwrights of the day. It is significant that the MHG. *Spiel vom jüngsten Tage*[8] shows many points of contact (so far as the motives are concerned) with the present poem.

But not only the dramatist, the lyric poet, too, was inspired by the subject, which is especially well-adapted for lyrical expression. As a

Apocalypse, though, of course, statements of medieval writers as to their sources are only to be accepted with a certain reserve. The passage in question is the following: 17830, 'Sint ich den sin han geregit / Daz ich beschribe die zit / Umme Antecristen und sit / Wen biz an den jungesten tac, / So sal ich, als ich beste mac, / Irsuchen tiefen sinnes such / In alle meisterliche buch / Die dar von iht gesprochen haben, / Und wil den sin gar undergraben, / Wen her ist tief gesprochen war.'

[1] One may gauge the popularity of the subject from the fact that the last judgment formed the contents of a Volksbuch, which has only been preserved in Simrock's reprint. Cf. Reuschel, *l.c.*, p. 88.

[2] On this point cf. Wadstein, *l.c.*, p. 7: 'Eschatologische Zeitbestimmung,' or Grau, *l.c.*, p. 6.

[3] On the question of the influence of the plastic arts on contemporary literature cf. especially the dissertation of Voss mentioned above, Jessen, *Die Darstellung des Weltgerichts bis auf Michelangelo*, Berlin, 1883, and Portig, *Das Weltgericht in der bildenden Kunst*, Heilbronn, 1885. The chapter on 'Bildende Kunst' in Wadstein, *l.c.*, p. 44, will also be found very useful.

[4] Cf. such well-known examples as the west porch of Amiens or Bourges.

[5] *E.g.*, on the tomb of Iñes de Castro at Alcobaça.

[6] See Wadstein, *l.c.*, p. 46.

[7] See Creizenach, *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*, 1893, Vol. I, pp. 77, 128, 232, 244.

[8] Edited by Klee, *l.c.*

proof of this, I need only refer to those noble medieval Latin hymns[1], such justly famous examples as the *Dies irae* attributed to Thomas of Celano. These hymns certainly helped to spread eschatologic ideas amongst the people. And again, the splendid array of German 'Sprüche[2]' on the subject furnish yet another proof of the vogue the themes enjoyed in popular estimation.

The end of the world and the last judgment have always been a favourite subject with the preacher, who is never tired of dilating on the horrors of the last day and of the necessity for the immediate repentance of those who would be saved. Advent is especially suited for such sermons. It is also worthy of note that the gospel for the last Sunday in the year, the Twenty-fourth Sunday after Whitsunday (dominica XXIV post pentecosten), is taken from the 24th chapter of St Matthew which contains a detailed description of doomsday[3]. A number of sermons on this gospel have been preserved[4] and it is interesting, on comparing them with poems on the same subject such as II, to see how closely related the two groups are. The poems are practically metrical recasts of the sermons: both contain the same thoughts, motives and illustrations[5]. From such considerations as the foregoing it is evident, I think, that the poem is closely related to the homiletic literature of the day. But even should this not be deemed sufficiently demonstrated, the following circumstance establishes the matter almost beyond doubt. In several poetical versions of the last judgment the Virgin Mary intercedes with her Son on behalf of

[1] Mone, *Lateinische Hymnen des Mittelalters*, I, Freiburg i. B. 1853, pp. 400–410.

[2] See Reuschel's Dissertation, p. 33. Cf. also the 'Sprüche' in Bartsch, *Meisterlieder der Colmarer Hs.* (Stuttg. Lit. Ver., Vol. LXVIII, 1862), especially 588, 75 and 589, 93.

[3] I would remind English readers that they will search in vain in the Book of Common Prayer for this gospel on the 23rd Sunday after Trinity, for the Anglican Church (like the Greek orthodox Church) has its own selection of pericopes and follows the 'Sarum Use.'

[4] The following are the principal collections of medieval German sermons: Grieshaber, *Deutsche Predigten des XIII. Jhs.*, Stuttgart, 1844. Schönbach, *Altdeutsche Predigten*, 3 vols., Graz, 1886–91. Leyser, *Deutsche Predigten des XIII. und XIV. Jhs.*, Quedlinburg, 1838. Wackernagel, *Altdeutsche Predigten und Gebete aus Handschriften*, Basel, 1876. Jeitteles, *Altdeutsche Predigten aus dem Benedictinerstifte St Paul in Kärnten*, Innsbruck, 1878.

[5] An excellent example of this is the sermon in Grieshaber, *l.c.*, I, p. 148 ff. Cf. also Schönbach, *l.c.*, II, Nr. 3, p. 14, Nr. 3, p. 9 ff., and Vol. I, 199a: 'de ascensione'; Jeitteles, *l.c.*, p. 14 ff.; Wackernagel, p. 182. On Easter Sunday the resurrection of our Lord offered the very best excuse for a sermon on the general resurrection at the sounding of the last trump. Cf., for example, Schönbach, *l.c.*, Vol. III, p. 76; Leyser, *l.c.*, p. 61. Or, again, we find that in a sermon for the Twentieth Sunday after Whitsunday the text from St John iv, 'Domine descende ut sanes filium meum priusquam moriatur,' is expounded from quite an eschatologic point of view (see Grieshaber, *l.c.*, p. 139 ff.). Cf. also the sermon in Schönbach with the significant title 'Sermo quando volueris per totum annum' which likewise contains a description of the last judgment (see Schönbach, Vol. II, Nr. 64).

the damned. The question as to whence this image was derived has been satisfactorily solved quite lately by the discovery of a similar passage in a sermon of Berthold of Regensburg[1]. Now this same image is also to be found in the second poem (II). We need hardly look for further evidence of the popular origin of this version, and it is making no very rash assertion to state that the author based his poem on the thoughts and ideas current in the sermons of the day. It is not impossible that such rhymed sermons were on occasion preached from the pulpit; at least we find similar metrical homilies in an English collection, which show every indication of having been used as veritable sermons[2].

It is no easy matter to form a fair estimate of the literary merit of the present poem. The author is anything but original—it is true that originality on theological questions was scarcely to be expected from an orthodox poet of the middle ages—but even the language itself is drawn very largely from the stock of words and formulas common to the didactic religious poetry of medieval Germany, a fact which may be easily verified by a comparison with the parallels I have collected in the commentary. It is a very ordinary didactic poem, neither more nor less, and it fulfilled its purpose if it so influenced men's minds and consciences as to lead them to repentance.

The author, or rather the authors—for, as will be seen presently, we must assume two such—were ecclesiastics; this follows quite clearly from such verses as 18 ff.: 'den zehenden teil zu rechte geben' or II, 278. That both poems I and II are to be considered as independent, unconnected productions is apparent, in the first place from the many otherwise meaningless repetitions such as II, 10 ff., and secondly from the positive assurance in II, 6 ff.: 'Daz kunde ich uch nu zu stunt,/Nach Sant Jeromimus sagen.' That they are, besides, the works of two separate authors, is evident from the fact that the two poems are composed in two distinct dialects, and also, that they show important differences of metrical technique. This will appear during the course of these investigations.

The poem on *The Signs of Doom* (I) is preserved on fol. 281^{v}—283^{v} of a single MS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale having the press mark All. 150[3]. The second poem on *The Last Judgment* (II) is to be found

[1] Cf. Klee, *l.c.*, p. 49 ff.

[2] Cf., for instance, the Homily for the second Sunday in Advent, *English Metrical Homilies*, edited by John Small, Edinburgh, 1862.

[3] The poem is also known to Dr Reuschel who mentions it on p. 336 of his book. Dr Reuschel also recognised the relation to Bede's version of the fifteen signs.

in two late MSS. which I have labelled P and V. P, the Paris MS.[1] above mentioned, I was able to collate myself. It consists of two originally distinct MSS. now bound together. The first, which contains the travels of Mandeville in the translation of Otto von Diemeringen, bears the date 1418, the second consisting of a collection of short poems was written at Spires in 1419, as appears from an entry of the scribe[2]. Poem II follows I immediately on folios 283^{v}—292^{r}. *The Last Judgment* is contained besides in MS. 356 of the Stadtbibliothek of St Gall (Vadiana). Privatdozent Dr Reuschel of Dresden very kindly placed at my disposal a transcript of this MS. copied by the librarian in St Gall, Dr Dierauer[3].

The two MSS. differ considerably. From a series of common mistakes[4], however, it is clear that they are both derived from the same original, which itself must have been corrupt in several instances. Both copyists are extremely careless in their work, but, from the investigation of the variant readings, it appears that V dealt much more freely with his original than did P. V shows a decided tendency to omissions, and, again, often makes an attempt to restore the true reading, whilst P for the most part is content to copy his text quite mechanically. I have therefore chosen P as the basis of the present text, but have given the preference to V now and then, especially in doubtful cases of word order.

Before proceeding with the investigation of the dialect in which these poems are written, we must first show, from a brief survey of their rhyme technique, that we are justified in assuming 'pure rhymes' for the original[5].

Poem no. I is composed of 52 rhyming couplets. Of these 46 are certainly 'rein[6],' and, this being the case, we are fully justified in making

[1] A brief description of this MS. will be found in Vol. I, p. 58 of this *Review*. An exhaustive account has been sent by Professor Priebsch to the Hss.-Archiv der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

[2] 'Dis buch ist geschribn̄ und vollebracht in dem Jare do man zalte von Christi geburte virtzehn hundert und Nunzehen Jare off Sant Stephans dag dez heiligen Babstes und Mertelers als die alt Kirch wyhunge ist dez Herren Stifftes der Stad zu Spir.'

[3] G. Scherer, on pp. 28 and 33 ff. of his book *St Galler Hss.*, St Gallen, 1859, gives a somewhat scanty description of this MS. and quotes the beginning and end of each poem. Reuschel also quotes a few extracts from the MS., *l.c.*, pp. 110, 142, 144.

[4] *E.g.*, 186, 263, 349.

[5] It is more or less evident from such spellings as the following that the MS. does not present the text in its original dialectical form: 3 lebent : geben, 41 geschehn : fliehen, 49 sol : uberal, 55 macht : crafft, 69 gewagen : tage, 73 offsten : emphan.

[6] And that in the proportion of 34 masculine to 12 feminine rhymes. The strong preponderance of masculine over feminine rhymes is very characteristic of MHG. poems of a later period, cf. Kochendörffer, *ZfdA.*, XXXV, 291. Besides these pure rhymes, there are two which may still be considered doubtful (17, 71), and four which for the eye are

use of the rhymes in order to fix the dialect of the poet. The rhymes point to Middle Franconia as his home. Cf. the following: 53 gezide : nyde, 103 missetaden : gnaden, 55 macht : crafft, 81 tag : gewach, 11 also : ho (cf. § 246)[1], 43 zurgan : slan (§ 52), 41 geschien : vlien (§ 53), 9 han : san (sagen) (§ 33). Amongst the other rhymes the following deserve mentioning: 69 gewagen (Inf.) : tage (§ 217), 39 crut : bluot (§ 140). We have no conclusive instance of apocope; 27 might also be read grunde : stunde and as for 45 stein (Masc. Pl.) : gemein, we note that feminine lines of four beats occur (see below p. 310). As regards umlaut, the rhyme 19 apgrunde : kunde is not conclusive, for kunde is probably prt. conj. Long and short vowel rhyming: 13 sin : min[2]. The forms gewagen 69 and sal 49, 89 are interesting. Single verbs: stan and gan only show â forms: 23 stan : getân, 31 verstan : undertân, 43 zurgan : slân, 59 ussgan : getân, 73 offstan : emphâm *P.B.B.* XXVIII, 4. The e-sounds are kept carefully apart in both poems and only rhyme with one another.

It is impossible from the scanty material at hand, to fix the dialect of the poem with any geographical exactitude. No uf, no unshifted p occurs in the rhyme and the characteristic MFr. flection of tuon (deist, deit) is wanting. In line 61 there occurs the word ersturt, past part. of erstürzen, which not being understood by the scribe, remained in its MFr. form with the unshifted t (cf. Paul, *Mhd. Gr.*, § 92). The spelling boven also points to a MFr. original[3]. The percentage of pure rhymes in the second poem (II) is also large enough to warrant our making use of them to determine the dialect in which the poem was originally composed.

certainly 'unrein' (13, 41, 55, 69); we shall see, however, that they only appear so from the point of view of High German.

[1] Paragraphs refer to Weinhold, *Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik*[2].

[2] Or sin[t] : min?

[3] Other words and expressions of dialectical interest are the following: 8 sich snellen = sich rasch bewegen, beeilen cf. Lexer; Bartsch, *Über Karlmeinet*, p. 324; Keller, *Erzählungen*, 255, 27. 15 boven especially a Low German word, but also MFr., see Lübben, *Mittelniederdeutsches Wörterbuch.* It is common in Modern Low and Middle German dialects, cf. Hönig, *Wörterb. der Kölner Mundart*, 1905; *Wörterbuch der Eupener Sprache*, 1899; Berghaus, *Sprachschatz der Sassen*, 1888. 63 sich vermechen, a rare, specially Low German word; see Lexer and Bartsch, *Über Karlmeinet*, p. 339. Bartsch translates 'hindern.' 75 by ein = 'bei einander,' 'zusammen.' Cf. Bartsch, *Erlösung*, p. 367, Note to 5112. Cf. also Herbort von Fritzlar, 5653 after ein = 'nach einander.' 82 gewach, a strong masc. ? = 'Erwähnung.' See Bartsch, *Über Karlmeinet*, p. 291, Müllenhof and Scherer, *Denkmäler*[3], II, p. 246. 90 For tal as a masculine cf. Braune, *Althochd. Gram.* § 196, note 1; Lexer, *Mittelhochd. Wörterb.*; Bartsch, *Erlösung*, Note to 1025 ('tal als Masc. und in der Zusammensetzung mit helle ist mir sonst nirgends begegnet und fehlt auch im mhd. Wörterb.'); cf., too, Kraus, *Deutsche Gedichte*, XI, 115 and the further references he quotes. Tal as a masc. we also find in poem no. II, 116. 100 enstan, 'werden,' like *Karlmeinet*, 195, 11. 101 scheit, str. Masc., 'Scheidung,' 'Trennung,' 'Sonderung.'

Poem no. II consists of 382 lines. From these we must deduct 4 rhymeless lines (65, 171, 215, 271), and the 4 odd lines of the 4 rhyming triplets (164, 208, 236, 318). There are thus 372 lines or 187 pairs of rhymes to be taken into consideration. Of these 164 are certainly pure[1], this leaves us with 23 rhyming couplets, which, for the present, must be considered 'unrein[2].' But it will appear below that the dialect accounts for all these seeming irregularities.

The following are the rhymes which are of importance for fixing the home of the poet: 319 dorst : rost[3], metathesis of the r? (§ 214). Dropping of n: (a) In the infinitive: 3 gesagen : tage[4], 59 dar : farn, 98 gewichen : glich[e], [222 fliessen : susse]; (b) In the Dative: 128 dotslegern : ebrecher; (c) In the flectional endings of verbs: 66 Adame (MS. adyme) : quamen, 86 gericht[e] : verslicht[en]. Dropping of h between vowels: 276 diet (MS. dietht) : verziet (zihet); a > o : 53 kol[e] : male; uo : u[5]: 377 dun : sun. Apocope: 311 bot N. Sg.[6] : erledigot, 134 schiere (adv.) : dier; the latter rhyme not conclusive, however, for one might also read diere, cf. Paul § 123 Note 4. Old flectional endings preserved (§ 361): 310 got : erledigot. 2nd pers. pl. in -nt: 188 kint : (ir) sint, but 74 sit : zit. Umlaut not carried out: 349 sunden : wunden, 39 turne : zurne? Short and long vowels rhyming: (mostly before n but also before other consonants) 120 gan : Adam, 265 kan[7] : getan, 272 man : stan, 377 dun : sun, 84 toden : geboden[8]. Single verbs: stan: 96 stan : getan, 272 man : stan; gan: 116 ergat : Josaphat, 120 gan : Adam; han: 80 rat : hat, 278 hat : wat, 130 hant : hand (manus), 234/5/6 hant : lant, 261 hant : uberl[anc], 3rd pers. pl. in short a, cf. *ZfdA.*, XLIV, 363[2] (the preterite does not occur in the rhyme); komen: pret. quamen 66 quamen : Adame. m : n 211 arm : farn, 120 Adam : gan. -iche: only forms with long i are found, cf. *ZfdA.*, XLV, 94: 98 gliche : gewîchen, 104 jemerlichen : entwîchen, 174 gezogenlichen : rîchen.

The above rhymes are, as a whole, characteristic of Middle German. Certain others (viz., 167, 261), which might have afforded us some definite clue, are unfortunately conjectures. The rhyme fliessen : süezen

[1] In the proportion of 116 masculine to 48 feminine rhymes. Cf., too, the note, page 302.

[2] Viz. 3, 43, 53, 59, 66, 78, 84, 98, 120, 136, 167, 204, 211, 213, 222, 261, 265, 272, 278, 319, 333, 377, 381.

[3] The MS. V reads frost. Weinhold, *Mhd. Gram.* § 214, only quotes one example of metathesis before st, viz. from *Rother*, 1587, where, however, 'vrosten' is not the rhyme-word. And so I am rather inclined to consider the case in point as an instance of the ecthlipsis of the r.

[4] V ich sage.

[5] Cf. von Bahder, *Über ein vokalisches Problem des Mitteldeutschen*, Habilitationsschrift, Leipzig, 1880, pp. 7, 35.

[6] V got.

[7] kam V.

[8] But this is the interpolated passage!

may be dismissed as an interpolation; dorst : rost—supported by the formula 'hunger und dorst' as against the reading of V—speaks in favour of Rhenish Franconian or Hessian. Everything seems to point the same way: the predominance of d (= Germanic d) in the in-sound of MS. P cannot be explained by the South Franconian dialect of the scribe. The rhyme 339 daz : basz precludes the possibility of the dialect being Middle Franconian; the great probability is then that the origin of II was written in Hessen or Rhenish Franconia[1].

As was mentioned above, the MS. P was written at Spires in 1419. The linguistic peculiarities of the MS. agree with what we know of the medieval dialect of that town. In many cases, however, it is impossible to differentiate between scribe and poet as both have many peculiarities in common. Firstly, as regards the dentals, we find that our MS. conforms almost exactly to the table as set up by O. Böhme on p. 19 of his dissertation (*Zur Kenntnis des Oberfränkischen im* XIII., XIV., *und* XV. *Jh.*, Leipzig, 1893). He gives the following data:

	Anlaut		Inlaut					Auslaut
		inl. Anl.	Nach Vokalen					
1400–1500	t (d)	t	t, tt	rt	lt	nd	-te	t

An investigation of the MS. gives the following results:

I	22 t 4 d	7 t	4 t 7 d[2] 6 tt	1 rt	4 ld	7 nd[3]	9 -te[4]	t[5]
II	22 t 19 d 1 th[6]	6 t	5 t 34 d 15 tt 1 td[7]	2 rt	3 lt	29 nd	9 -te	

The numerous d's in the on-sound of II are probably derived from the original; the predominance of d in the in-sound must likewise be explained as belonging to RhFr. or a still more northerly dialect.

[1] The many 'vochten' of MS. P are scarcely all due to the scribe; the metrical characteristics, as will be seen below, also point to central Germany as the home of the poet. The two emendations 261 lanc : hant and 167 verwen : werben are both in accordance with MFr.-Hessian dialectical peculiarities. For the first cf. Weinhold, *Mhd. Gram.*, § 219 and Bethmann, *Untersuchungen über die mhd. Dichtung vom Grafen Rudolf* (*Palaestra*, XX), p. 22 ff.; for the second see Bethmann, *l.c.*, p. 28.

[2] Including a spurious d in 'vermaledide' (I, 99).

[3] We find nt quite regularly in winter (see Paul, § 74, 4, note 1), cf., too, gesegenten 299.

[4] Four wolte instead of the usual wolde (cf. Paul, § 71, 4, note 2).

[5] Exceptions (*a*) 131 hand (manus); possibly to differentiate from the homonymous rhyme. Elsewhere we find hant. (*b*) 109, 112 sind.

[6] II, 39.

[7] II, 269.

The following peculiarities are common to most Middle German MSS.; only a few are specifically Hessian: II, 15 bronnen. II, 39 thorne, 82, 90, 102 komet, 96 konig, 113 sonnen, 160, 280 dorch (but 281 durch), 324 dorres. II, 56 nummer, likewise ummer 305, 308, 345, 356, 364 (but nommer II, 49, 290), cf. § 50 and J. Meier, *Jolande, Germ. Abhandl.*, VII, p. xxxii. II, 62, 214 soment cf. § 121. e for i: 219 weder. 298 freidenrich, 351 freide cf. § 128. 360 bradet (â-umlaut not denoted). I, 13, 77, 80, II, 2, 11, 43, 76, 106, 213, 281, 291, 301 off; but 243 uff cf. § 122. 221 mede cf. § 34 and Sievers, *Benediktinerregel*, p. xiii. vochten (8 times: II, 20, 33, 52, 73, 89, 95, 334, 338) cf. Kraus, *Deutsche Gedichte*, XI, 101 and Sievers, *l.c.*, IX ff.[1] I, 8 dinst (Middle Germ. shortening). 213 erden (the Middle Germ. characteristic weak declension) cf. § 461. biedent, 265, 275, wyeget 176 (ie probably another spelling for i, or possibly an instance of 'Nachschlagvokal' cf. § 48, Wilmanns, *Gram.*, I, § 220, Bethmann, *l.c.*, p. 40). thorne II, 39 cf. § 201. 226 schopfer, 269 zwolff cf. § 29, *Jolande*, p. xxii. I, 101 siecht, II, 25 gediecht, 379 angesiecht cf. Weinhold, *Alem. Gram.*, § 45, but see biedent, etc., above. pf is the rule in South Franconian[2]: II, 155 opfer cf. Braune, *Ahd. Gram.*, § 133 note, 226 schopfer. Nasalising: 332 meinsterschaft, § 217. I, 70 drytzehensten, 81 funffzehenste (elsewhere funffzehen, e.g., I, 2; II, 8, 27, etc.) cf. § 338; raden ich cf. Paul, *Mhd. Gram.*, § 167, note 3, *M.S.D.*[3], II, 386. 2nd pers. pl. in -nt: II, 40 sehent, 70 horent, 75 wachent, 76 sollent, 84 wachent, 86 koment, 106 stant cf. § 369 and § 371, Paul, *Mhd. Gram.* § 155, note 3. Addition of a spurious e in the Nom. Sing.: 208 mensche, 340 wunsche cf. § 448.

The following peculiarities are of orthographical interest: 276 dietht. II, 8 zurgee (doubling as a sign of length ?). 131 linckt. f is often doubled (34 times), even after diphthongs and long vowels, e.g., 163 brieffe, 362 ryff. n and m (more rarely l) are also frequently doubled after a short vowel, e.g., II, 10, 15, 17, 28, 49, 83, 119, 172, 173, etc. The spirant derived from Germanic t is spelled variously z, s, ss, sz without any apparent rule, z even renders an old s, e.g., 199, 229 waz = was. The t in glant 113 is probably a slip for c of the original, cf. the spelling of *Jolande*, 3991 ganc, and introduction p. li. Suppression of a weak e: II, 32 michels, 44 gnug, 119, 292, 382 himelsche, 161 zehendn, 218, 377 megde (but 259 megeden, 221 mede)[3], 250 antwurt,

[1] But cf. p. x where Sievers says he has not followed the phenomenon farther South.

[2] On the pf:pp boundary in modern Spires see Bohnenberger, *Zs. f. hochd. Mundarten*, IV, 129 seq.

[3] See Rieger, *Das Leben der heiligen Elisabeth* (Stuttgart Lit. Ver., vol. xc), 1868, p. 30.

334 kunde = kundete?, 299 gesegenten, 304 tufels, 353 fynsters. Instead of ou, oü we have au, aü, e.g., I, 9, 39; II, 19, 23, 39, etc. The sign ū has a very varied application: short and long u are thus denoted, it appears also for older uo (e.g., 159 gūde), for the umlaut of u and û (e.g., I, 2 funff[1], 160 kusch). The same applies to ü. The simple u is used for u and its umlaut. y is often found instead of i (some 140 times), once for ie (e.g., 171 lygen). This is especially the case before or after nasals, but we have no certain indication of the further regulations as laid down in *P.B.B.*, XXII, 265. The usual abbreviations occur.

The MS V, as was noted above, is preserved at St Gall. That the scribe, too, was a native of Alemannia is proved by the following dialectical peculiarities:

ai for a: 49 klaiget, 51 ain (ain also 56, 163, 197, 201), 139, 379 aingesicht, 348 ainvanck, 350 kain, the rhyme 169 veratten : mainaiden, cf. Fischer, *Geographie des schwäbischen Mittelalters*, Map 15, Rudolf von Ems, Junk *Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters*, p. xxix, Weinhold, *Mhd. Gram.*, § 123, Weinhold, *Alem. Gram.*, § 34. Once (22 tailen) we have ai for the umlaut of a, three times a for ai: 75 gan = gain = gein = gegen, 11 zachen, 161 tal. ou > o (öu > ǒ): 19, 324 lob, 23 tobet, 39 bǒm, 110 tob, 125, 132, 163, 262 och, 158 geloben, 165, 323 rob, 222 ogen, 351 frǒd cf. *Alem. Gram.*, § 42. e > ö 269 zwǒlf cf. *Alem. Gram.*, § 28, 117. â > ô: 59, 137 one, 296 vne?, 34, 322, 376 won cf. *Alem. Gram.*, § 44. ch < k: 128 Chain. m : n : 265 kam : getan, 269 sament : genamt. Nasalising: 60 ewenklich, 160 kunschlichen; 3rd pers. sg. pres. ind.: 24 schigent, 214 soment; past part.: 234, 262, gedienent, 235 gevastent. Dropping of n in consequence of nasalising: 304 sprechet (or = 3rd pers. sg.? cf. *Alem. Gram.*, § 331). 2nd pers. pl. in -ent: 303 hǒrent cf. Paul, *Mhd. Gram.*, § 155, note 3. 354 niment Weinhold, *Mhd. Gr.*, § 348. i < iu: 152, 153 guoti, 141 turnini, 292 himelschi, 332 frǒlichi, 130 weli < welhiu (cf. Weinhold, *Mhd. Gr.*, § 490). The words: kilche 157, mentsch 137, 190, 193, 208, 232, 295, 352 (cf. *Alem. Gram.*, § 175). sond 300 cf. Paul, *Mhd. Gram.*, § 181. gnuo 44. den tode (addition of a spurious e cf. Weinhold, § 448). a-umlaut not carried out: 218, 229 maget (but 221, 259 mǎgten), 289 tusentfaltigen, 303 angstlichen, 360 bratt. High Germ. apocope is very common, e.g., in the substantival declension: 13 berg nom. pl., 119 all himelsch nom. pl., 124 tod dat. sing., 141 kron nom. sing.; in the verb: 188 grütz 1st pers. sing. pres. ind., 201 sag 2nd pers. sing.

[1] On funf see Kauffmann, *P.B.B.*, XII, 512, note 1.

imper., 124 wolt 3rd pers. sing. pret. Suppression of e: 44, 46, 52 mǎncklich, 127 verretren, 129 wůchrer, 148 jecklichs, 225 spricht, 229 magte, 230 gnad, 299 gesegnotten, 353 finsters, 357 manger, 370 kŭng. t in the 3rd pers. plur. pret. of str. verbs: 110, 115 wārent, 222 begundent, 237 liessent, 286 tattent. s interchanges with ss: e.g., s for ss: 252, 378, 381 můsent, 365 bisen (perhaps, too, 339 wisen); ss for s: 124 lŏssen, 125 bŏssen, 154 almůssen cf. Weinhold *Mhd. Gram.*, §§ 207, 209. 130 gebůtzet, 188 grůtz cf. *Alem. Gram.*, § 185. h > ch: 12 veriechent, 47 lechen, 40, 190, 381 sechen, 156 empfachen, 157 gachen, Weinhold, *Mhd. Gram.*, § 234. The lenis t: 31 tonren, 141 turnini, 194 tornen, 324 tŭres, Paul § 63. w written for b, 147 unverwunden, cf. Weinhold, *Mhd. Gr.*, § 178, and Marold in his *Tristan* edition, pp. xi, xxx. d for t in the off-sound of 3rd pers. plur.: 38 stossend, 106 stand etc., but also in other instances, e.g., 124 tod; in all these cases we also have t, apparently without rule. In the off-sound tt is very common, especially in such words as ratt, gott, nott etc. The usual assimilation after n: 161 zehenden, 169 hinder etc. mb already assimilated to mm > m: 47, 193, 276 umb, 108 krum, 172 nimpt. The following forms deserve a passing note: 222 begundent cf. *ZfdA.*, XLV, 29. 193a zerblon. 109, 112, 143 dŏrt. 178 het. 244 tröst = tröstt = tröstet. Umlaut in the plur. ind.: 28 sŏlent, cf. § 411. 350 nüt cf. Weinhold, *Mhd. Gram.*, § 494. sw regularly > schw. The rhyme 169 veratten : mainaiden seems to be an interesting instance of an unshifted d (= Germanic d) in the in-sound, which, if not impossible in Alemanic, is rare[1]. The curious form 53 schwart with unshifted t is probably a scribal error (cf. glant, P. 113, and see above p. 306). 163, 349, tiefel (nom. sing.), 293 (nom. plur.), but 132 (= V 92) we have tŭflen (dat. plur.). The following are of orthographical interest: 343 lilgen. The umlaut of a is written ǎ except in 30 mengen, 115 werent; once ǎ is wrongly put for old e viz. 278 wār = quis. The umlaut of o is written ŏ, that of u ŭ. The diphthong uo is denoted by ů. The umlaut of uo is written ŭ, ü. ai regularly renders an older ei. Doubling of consonants: 213 uff, 274 nitt etc. y is always found for ie in the nom. and acc. plur., or the nom. acc. sing. fem. of the personal pronoun sy, otherwise we find i. b, d, g remain in the auslaut. daz and waz are abbreviated to dz (140,

[1] For a few isolated examples cf. Braune, *Ahd. Gram.*, § 163, note 5; *M.S.D.*[3], II, 577; Marold's *Tristan* edition, pp. xii, xxi, xxx, xxxviii; Wackernagel, *Altd. Pred.*, p. 475; Böhme's *Dissertation*, p. 38.

375) and wz (201), which are perhaps to be placed on a par with the specifically Alemanic abbreviations dc wc, cf. *P.B.B.*, XXXIII, 379. The substitution of ai for a renders it extremely probable that the MS. was written at St Gall itself; ai for ei confirms this; it was characteristic of the dialects of the Thurgau, St Gall, Constance from the beginning of the thirteenth cent. (cf. *P.B.B.*, XXXIII, 378; *Germanist. Abhandlungen*, XXI, 25).

It is apparent to the most casual observer of the metre that the lines will not conform to the usual scheme of four lifts for masculine, and three lifts for feminine endings, even with the assumption of three to four syllables 'Auftakt[1]' and frequent 'beschwerte Hebung.' This irregularity, however, is not due to a corrupt text; it is accounted for by the freer metrical technique which was in vogue in Low and Middle Germany during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries[2]. The chief criterion of this metre is the freedom which is permitted with regard to over-burdened feet; dips of two[3] and even of three[4] unaccented syllables are quite frequent, and it is by no means easy to adjust the metre to the accepted schedule by means of syncope and such like expedients. It may be laid down as a general rule that the lines are to be read in a natural tone of voice, allowing at the same time for frequent examples of 'beschwerte Hebung[5].' I will only anticipate

[1] An Auftakt of 2 syllables occurs: I, 1, 8, 13, 15, 22, 27, 28, 29, 30, 42, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 59, 60, 68 (sollen), 70, 76 (alle), 84 (alle), 86, 88, 96, 97 (zu den), 98, 100, 103 (daz sie); II, 8 (wie die), 9, 17 (alle), 56 (sie en-), 60, 79, 83, 135, 146 (sine), 148, 156, 173, 207, 209, 218 (alle). 241 (omitted in V), 250, 253, 264, 266, 270, 285, 288, 295 (sine), 309, 311, 337, 343, 344, 348, 349, 350, 351 (sine), 358.

Auftakt of 3 syllables: I, 35, 44; II, 53, 96, 116 (sie koment), 118, 132 (dar komet), 207, 225 (Maria, or to be accented as a dissyllable Márja? There is perhaps a scribal error here, and we should possibly read 'sie sprichet'), 298, 304 sie sprichet, 322, 341, 376?, 382 (des helffe). As is evident from the above examples, many of these Auftakte might easily be reduced a syllable by means of slurring, syncope, etc.

[2] Cf. Paul's *Grundriss*[2], II, 88 seq.

[3] Examples are very numerous. Many of them are 'leicht,' e.g., the cases where a single consonant comes between two unaccented e's; others, on the other hand, are not so easily reduced to monosyllables.

[4] The following instances occur: I, 17, 23, 33, 41, 42, 44, 50, 59, 68, 70, 75, 100; II, 11, 19, 54, 56, 90, 98, 124, 130, 163, 172, 177, 183, 231, 242, 266, 302, 334. Line 164 cannot be made to fit in with any metrical scheme.

[5] Cf. Jänicke, *Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung des Seifried Helbing*, *ZfdA.*, XVI, 402; Kraus, *Zur Kritik des Meier Helmbrecht*, *ZfdA.*, XLVII, 305; Kraus, *Zur Kritik der Rittertreue*, *ZfdA.*, XLVIII, 103. Cf., too, Brendel, *Über das mhd. Gedicht 'der Borte,'* Halle 1906 (Dissertation), p. 33 seq. Although we have to deal here mostly with poems of the classical period of MHG. literature, yet the rules formulated in these treatises bearing on 'beschwerte Hebung' apply equally well to poems of a later period. I quote the examples of 'beschwerte Hebung' in full: (*a*) After the 2nd lift: 1, 4, 16, 49, 64, 90, 100, 102; II, 6, 29, 42, 134, 178, 318, 331, 339, 347, 361, 362, 369, 376. (*b*) In a few other cases authorised by the universal practice of MHG. poets. The word accent plays a great part here: I, 19 apgrunde, 28 offkomen, 29 freysslich, 53 Adame, 63 yclicher, 68 ertrich, 70 drýtzèhensten, 74 urteil, 76 by ein, 77 jglicher, 81 fúnfzèhenste, 92 lieplich; II, 27 fúnfzèhen, 50 richtum, 52 menlich, 66, 120 Adam, 69, 312 man unde

so far as to mention that in this respect poem no. I shows much more freedom than II, which fact probably has some connection with its more northerly home[1].

It seems impossible to avoid recognising masculine lines of only three beats[2]. This appears unmistakably from the following examples which can hardly be ascribed to a corrupted text, there being absolutely no evidence of any omission or scribal error of any sort: I, 3, 37, 55, 69, 83, 87; II, 26, 37, 38, 58, 69, 157, 184, 200, 219, 235, 296 ?, 314, 342.

Similarly, there are numerous examples of feminine lines of four lifts: I, 8, 15, 16, 17 ?, 18, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 45, 46, 48, 54, 61, 62, 63, 64, 71, 96, 103, 104; II, 11, 16, 36, 46, 50, 53, 54, 92, 98, 99, 105, 124, 126, 127, 128, 129, 137, 141, 147, 158, 159, 167, 168, 169, 202, 203, 222, 253, 260, 295, 343, 344, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 373, 374. It is curious to note how such lines seem to occur in groups of three or four.

We have several instances of rhyming triplets, though they are not used, as they often were in MHG. poetry, to indicate the end of a paragraph[3]: II, 206 mich : mich : ich, 234 hant : hant : lant, 316 selikeit : arbeit : bereit. Of these 206 and 234 are so-called identical rhymes, to this latter category might be added: I, 29 -lich : -lich, 68 himelrich : ertrich; II, 230 -heit : -keit (cf. *ZfdA.*, XLV, 304 seq.), 247 geeret : geeret (omitted in V), 274 lich : lich. The following cases of so-called 'rührende Reime' occur: I, 87 stan : verstan; II, 298 freidenrich : rich (regnum), 130 hant (habent): hand (manus) cf. *ZfdA.*, XLV, 286. I note the following instances of hiatus: II, 2, 90, 283, 317, 318 (but cf. 329), 377.

The comparatively late date of the MSS. renders an attempt to discriminate between the dialectic peculiarities of poet and copyist out

wip, 71 grosz unde cleyn, 108 krump oder sleht, 110 daup oder blint, 126 rihteren, 127 verrederen, 128 dotsleger, 129 ebrecher, 132 valant, 156 lieplich, 160 kuschlich, 162, 230 warheit, 168 unrecht, 173, 244 heilant, 193, 352 menschheit, 202 ellende, 291 offsten, 303 engstlichen, 306, 317 arbeit, 341 frolichen. (*c*) In enumerations: II, 19 laub, gras, 48 golt, sylber, 165 steln, raub, mord, brant, 236 lip, lude. (*d*) In a few other somewhat doubtful instances for the sake of emphasis: I, 6 her nach ?, 89 got selber. II, 5 forchtlich (cf. the modern pronunciation fúrchtbàr), 7 Jeronimús ságen ?, 18 kein hertze, 34 zurgán sól ?, 44 gnug wit ?, 46 sin criegen ?, 74, 88 disz ist, 83 also, 99 nyeman, 106 stant off, 100 állèn ge-, 112 dort sind, 141 dornyne, 143 dort her, 149 dér zéiget yé sá, 160 gót kúschlich ?, 180 got selber, 184 got scheidet, 200 den léit ich dúrch dich ?, 212 bass han, 234 die mir, 247 dich hat, 268 der gat, 272 héilige, 276 súndige, 286 uch daden, 289 tusentvéltigen, 294 fúrigen, 300 éwigen, 359 híe húnger, dá dórst.

[1] Cf. Paul's *Grundriss*[2], p. 88.

[2] It is a moot-point whether owing to the vowel lengthening process the 'verschleifbaren' lines of three beats are not to be considered as 'klingend' for our poet. Of the above I, 3, 37, 69; II, 37, 38, 219, 296, 314, would then be examples of regular feminine lines of three beats.

[3] See Wackernagel, *Literaturgeschichte*, § 48, note 39.

of the question, especially since, as we shall see below, the home of II cannot be located with any degree of certainty. And so I have ventured to restore the language of the poet only in a few cases where the rhyme offered a certain security[1]. The orthography of the best MS. P has been retained throughout. In the critical appendix I have only given such variants as seemed indispensable for a true perception of the relation of the two MSS. to one another, whereas general alterations of spelling and dialect forms are grouped together above. Instances of apocope in V are only noticed where they occur in the rhyme and might be considered of importance for metrical questions. It seemed to me a still more hazardous undertaking to attempt textual alterations for metrical reasons, as the loosely constructed metre of the poem affords but the slightest support for such emendations[2]. In order to indicate clearly the relation of the two MSS., I have added the numbering of V in brackets in the margin. The specification of the folios refers to P. The abbreviations of the MS. have been resolved without further comment. Emendations and conjectures are indicated in the foot-notes, where, if they are not my own, the names of their respective authors are added. The passages which I hold to be interpolations of the MS. P are enclosed in square brackets. I am alone responsible for the punctuation.

[1] If, however, the dialect is, as I believe, Hessian, the following alterations were justified: 100 geseit; cleit changed to saget; claget in accordance with *ZfdA.*, XLIV, 353, and similarly all -lîchen to -lîche in such verses as 98, 239, 381 (cf. *ZfdA.*, XLV, 94 and Bethmann, *Untersuchungen über die mhd. Dichtung vom Grafen Rudolf*, *Palaestra*, XX, p. 36).

[2] Such were, for instance, the following, some of which are very tempting, but I have not ventured to insert them in the text:—I, 30 g[e]lich, 36 welt[e] (also in II, 67), 40 rot[ez], 66 wunderlich[e], 91 wol[e]; II, 13 dan[ne], 63 vier[e], 96 zu recht[e]. und[e] instead of und: I, 9; II, 95, 154, 175, 176, 204, 343. jung[i]ste: II, 4, 72, 182, 380 (but cf. II, 88, 117). The insertion of the pleonastic article: II, 199, 208, 351, cf. also II, 58, 142, 145. In the following cases, however, the emendation seemed to be justified by the grammar or the rhyme, and I have admitted them to the text: I, 27–8, 45–6; II, 86–7, 140–1, 239–40, 274–5.

I.

Die vunvzehen zeichen.

f. 281^{v} Vor dem jungsten tage sol geschehen
Funfftzehen zeichen sol man sehen,
Alle die dan leben.
Nu wil ich mich dar zu geben,
Daz ich sie lasse verstan:
Sie werdent her nach gan.
Wer sie sol horen erzelen,
Der sol sich zu gottes dinst snellen
Und got vor augen han.
Nu wil ich uch daz erste san.
Daz erste zeichen ist also,
Daz sich daz mere sol heben ho
Und alle wasser, die off der erden sin,
Vyrtzig clafftern—me noch min—
Boven alle berge, wider ir nature,
Und sollen stan als ein mure.
Dez anders tages sollen die wasser alle
Hernyder komen mit eyme valle
So dyeffe in apgrunde,
Daz enkein mensche gesehen kunde,
War die wasser komen weren.
Dez mag sich ein iglich mensche erferen!
Dez drytten tages sollen die wasser stan
f. 282^{r} Als sie vor ewig hatten getan.
Dez vyrden tages sol geschehen,
Jemerlich ding sol man sehen:
Waz da lebet in dez meres grunde,

1 geschehn. 3 lebent. 15 und ir. Cf. *Martina* by Hugo von Langenstein, p. 177, 139^{b}, 51 Sich daz mere uf rihte :... | Wider siner rehten nature. 17 wassere. 20 e kein. 22 erfern. 27 grunt.

Quindecim signa quindecim dierum ante diem judicii invenit Hieronymus in annalibus Hebraeorum. Prima die eriget se mare in altum quadraginta cubitis, super altitudinem montium, et erit quasi murus et amnes similiter. Secunda die descendent usque ad ima, ita ut summitas eorum vix conspici possit. Tertia die erunt in aequalitate, sicut ab exordio. Quarta die pisces et omnes belluae marinae

Daz sol offkomen in der stunde
Und zu samen ruffen freysslich,
Daz man nie gehorte dez glich.
Daz enmag nyeman verstan
Dan got; dem ist alle ding undertan.
Dez funfften tages sol ein weder komen,
Daz nye so gross enwart vernomen,
Und sol die wasser verbrynnen in der zit,
Wo sie sint in der welt wit.
An dem sechsten tage,
—Nu horent waz ich uch sage!—
Sollen die baume und alle crut
Von engsten switzen rot blut.
Dez sybenden tages sol ein zeichen geschien,
Daz die lute unter die erde sollen flien;
Wan ir wonunge sollen zurgan:
Die gottes gewalt sol sie dar nyder slan.
Dez achten tages sollen die steine
Zu samen faren alle gemeine,
Und sich alle zu samen tryben,
f. 282^{v} Daz ein teil an dem andern nit sol blyben,
Wan der engstlicher tag komen sal,
Daz got selber gibet urteil uberal.
An dem nunden tage sol ein ertbydem komen,
Die nie so gross enwart vernomen
Von Adames gezide,
Wan sie sol komen mit grossem nyde
Und mit grosser macht.
Daz sol dun die gottes cracht.
Dez zehenden tages sol berge und dal
Sich gelichen uberal.
An dem eylfften tage sollen die lude ussgan,

28 stunt. 41 geschehn. 42 fliehen. 44 gewalt gottes. Cf. verses 8, 56 and Paul, *Mhd. Gr.*, § 190, 2. 45 stein. 46 gemein. 53 adames. 56 crafft.

---

et congregabuntur super aquas, et dabunt voces et gemitus, quarum significationem nemo scit nisi Deus. Quinta die ardebunt ipsae aquae ab ortu suo usque ad occasum. Sexta die omnes herbae, et arbores sanguineum rorem dabunt. Septima die omnia aedificia destruentur. Octava die debellabunt petrae ad invicem, et unaquaeque in tres partes se dividet, et unaquaeque pars collidet adversus alteram. Nona die erit terraemotus, qualis non fuit ab initio mundi. Decima die omnes colles et valles in planitiem convertentur, et erit aequalitas terrae. Undecima die homines exibunt

Die sich under die erde hatten getan,
Und sollen ersturt sin und erferet,
Und von engsten sere besweret,
Daz yclicher sal sich vermechen
Den andern an zu sprechen.
Dez zwolfften tages sol man sien
Wunderlich ding geschien:
Daz die stern von hymelrich
Sollen nyderfallen off daz ertrich.
Dez ich uch sol gewagen
Sol geschehen an dem drytzehensten tage:
f. 283r Dan sollen sterben die lute geliche,
Beyde arm und riche,
Wan sie mit den toden mussent offstan
Und urteil von gode emphan.
Dez virtzehenden tages sollen der lute bein
Alle wyder komen by ein,
Und jglicher off sin grab,
Da sie waren komen ab,
Und sollen menschen werden,
So wie sie lebten off erden.
Dan komet der funfftzehenste tag;
Von dem wil ich uch dun gewach,
Daz zu derselben stunt
Alle ding verbrynnent in den grunt.
Dar nach komet der jungste tag,
Da ich uch nit abe bescheiden mag,
Wan wie es dan sol stan,
Daz enwolte got nie lassen verstan,
Wan got selber komen sal
Zu Josaphat in den tal.

61 erfert. 62 beswert. 64 d. a. tag a. z. s. tag has obviously been introduced from 65, cf. the Latin. 65 sehen. 66 geschehen. 71 gemeyn. 73 sten. 77 There is an anacoluthon here; jglicher agrees with der lute 75.

---

de cavernis suis, et current quasi amentes, nec poterit alter respondere alteri. Duodecima die cadent stellae et signa de coelo. Decimaquarta die omnes homines morientur, ut simul resurgent cum mortuis. Decimatertia die congregabuntur ossa defunctorum, et exurgent usque ad sepulchrum. Decimaquinta die ardebit terra usque ad inferni novissima, et post erit dies judicii.

Die guten, die wol habent getan,
Die sol er lieplich enphan
Und zu in sprechen dyse wort:
f. 283v 'Gebenedite, gent her fort
Jn mynes vatter riche,
Daz ir sollent besitzen ewicliche.'
Zu den bosen sol er sprechen
—Daz ensol in nit vermechen—:
'Vermaledide, gent in die pin,
Da uch ewiclich enstat ynne zu sin.'
Da siecht man ein jemerliche scheit.
So sol es in dan sin leit,
Daz sie weder got ye myssetaden.
Nu helffe uns got mit siner gnaden!—Amen.

95 rich. 96 ewiclich. 100 enstet.

II.

Wie got das jungst gericht besitzen sol.

Wer nu diz buch vernemen wil,
Der swige stille off ein zil
Als ich uch nu kan gesagen
Von dem jungsten tage,
Wie forchtlich uns der wirt kunt.
Daz kunde ich uch nu zu stunt
Nach Sant Jeronimus sagen,
Wie die welt zurgee in funfftzehen tagen.
In den selben tagen vil zeichen beschehent,
f. 284r Allso uns dye bucher veriehent:
Daz mere sich uber alle berge offleynet,

Title in V: [di]s ist das iungst gericht. 1 nu wanting V. schön mär V. 3 och P, a. i. u. nu sage V. 5 w. f. er uns k. V. 6—18 V erased but for the verse endings. 6 .....ich ze stund V. 7 .....imus sage V. 8 .....ergatt in xv tagen V. 9 = V 11 .....vil zachen geschehent V. (V 9 =.....tag koment.) 10 = V 12 .....veriechent V. (V 10 =.....ag den gefrumen.) 11 = V 13 .....all berg ufflainet V.

Ein iglich auge weinet
Dann sine schulde
Umb unseres herren hulde.
Die bronnen sich vergiessent,
Die wasser sich zu samen fliessent,
Alle wasser verbrynnent dan als ein stro:
So ist kein hertze fro.
Laub, gras und alle cruter gut,
Die swytzent dan von vochten blut.
Die berge sinckent dan zu stunt
Zu den telin in den grunt.
So daubet aller vogel gesang
Und swiget aller seyten clang,
Und alles daz ye wart gedicht,
Daz wirt dan zu nicht.
Von dysen funfftzehen tagen
Sollen wir ummer clagen und sagen.
Sie sint haiss, sie sint kalt,
Sie machent manchen jungen alt.
Der donre gruwet sere
Und hagelt michels mere.
f. 284v Es ist alles vochten vol,
Wan die welt zurgan sol.
Die winde sich dan merent,
Von eyme lande zum andern kerent
Und kerent dan her wyder,
Und stossent danyder
Baume und grosse turne.
Sehent wie got zurne!
Es ist kein palast so grosz,
Er hat dan einen stoss,
Daz er off der erden lit:
So hat dan menlich gnug wit.

12 = V 14 .....net V. 15 = V 16 .....ssent V. (V 15 = ...) 16 = V 17 .....nt. V. 17 = V 18 .....ain stro V. 18 wanting V. 20 denn V (always) v. rechter not V. 25 gediecht P. 27 den V. 29 s. s. by der wilen haiss by der wylen kalt P. 31 tonren V, singent V. 32 und haglet in das mere V. 36 v. ainem berg zů dem a. k. V, v. e. l. sie z. a. k. P. 39 grosse omitted V, thorne P. 40 s. w. g. denn z. V. 43 erde V. 44 Various emendations for this perplexing passage have been suggested to me: 'so lat dan menlich sinen strit' (Jellinek), 'So hat dan menlich ingang wit' or 'gnug wît' (= wîte = Raum) (Priebsch). Cf., also, the curious passage in Wackernagel,

Ich wil nu nit liegen,
Da let menlich sin criegen
Umb eygen und lehen und umb lant.
Golt, sylber und duer gewant
Klaget man nommer mere,
Dan ez zurflusset richtum und ere.
Owe! so gat ez erst an die not.
Dan vochtet menlich den tot,
Dan wirt der mane swartzer dan ein kole,
Die sonne verluset iren schin zu male,
Die sterne vallent dan hernyder,
Die enkoment nummer an den hymmel wider.
f. 285r Dan wirt der sunder sigeloss;
Sin jamer der wirt gross.
Der ane ruwen kommet dar,
Der muss ewicklichen in ruwen farn.
So dis allesament geschicht,
So soment sich die engel nicht:
Ir vyer blasent vyer horn,
Die got darzu hat erkorn.
[So sprichet der engel mit grymme:
(a) Er rufet mit luter stymme:
Alle die von Adame
Je zu der welt quamen,
Beyde sele und lip,
Man unde wip,
Horent alle gemeyn
Beide gros und cleyn:
Hie ist der jungste tag,
Den der sunder wol vochten mag!
Diss ist die jungste zit;

Predigten, *l.c.*, pp. 187, 213: 'an dem sechsten tage so vallet alles das gebiuw nider das von stein werk gemachet ist, niut von holtz werk.' Could 'wit' in the text possibly = wite (wood) with lengthening of i in the open syllable as line 84 tôden : geboden? 45 nu wanting V. 46 so V. 47 und omitted P. 48 gůt g. V. 50 ist zerflossen V. 51 get P, Owe denn g. V. 52 tode V. 53 schwart als V, kol P. 54 verlůret V, ze mal V. 55 sternen V. 56 sy k. a. d. h. n. w. V. 57 sin los V. 58 der omitted V. 59 die a. r. koment d. V. 60 die můssent V. 63 hie fier b. ain h. V. 65—105 omitted in V. 65a is a conjecture of my own. Interpolated by P perhaps under the influence of some dramatic version of the story. Cf., too, the faulty composition of the whole passage, the many meaningless repetitions, e.g.: 72, 73 : 86, 89 (almost word for word): 75, 84: 81, 85. 66 adyme P.

Nu wachent alle die hie sit!
Vil balde sollent ir off stan,
Vor unserm herren gan.
Er wil richten swere
Uber lip und uber sele.
Dez enmag nit werden rat,
f. 285v Wan ers selbe geboden hat.'
Der ander engel komet auch do
Und begynnet sprechen also:
'Nu wachent alle toden!
Disz hat got selbe geboden.
Nu koment vor gerichte,
Da sich alle ding verslichten.
Wan disz ist der jungste tag,
Den alle die welt wol vochten mag.'
Der drytte engel komet auch zu hant
Und zeuget uber alle lant:
'Den dag den man sicht erschinen,
Daz ist ein dag der pinen,
Wan daz urteil ist gerecht.
Es fochtet rytter und knecht.
Da mus der konig dem hirten zu recht stan,
Hat er ym it unglichs getan.
Da koment sie vor gerichte also gliche,
Da kan nyeman gewichen.
Daz sy uch allen gesaget:
Die sunde uber den sunder claget.'
Der vyrde engel komet auch dar,
Er nymmet dez zornigen richters war.
f. 286r Er klaget jemerlichen,
Daz got sinem zorn nit wil entwichen.]
(65) Sie sprechent: 'Nu stant off alle toden
Gantz und unverschroden!'
Sie waren krump oder slecht,
Dort sind sie alle gerecht.
Sie waren daup oder blint,
(70) Oder wie sie geheissen sint,
Dort sind sie alle gantz,

86 gericht P. 87 verslicht P. 98 glich P. 100 geseit P. 101 cleit P. 106 er sprichet P, so stant o. a. t. V.

Recht als der sonnen glantz,
In der selben besten gestalt,
Recht als sie weren dryssig jar alt.
Sie koment hin in den tal zu Josaphat,
Da daz jungste gericht ergat.
Dar komet got und die liebe mutter sin,
Und alle hymmelsche megetin.
Dar komet der erste Adam
Und der jungest man alzu gan.
Dar koment alle die guden kint,
Die ye hie geborn sint,
Die got mit syme tode wolte losen.
Dar koment auch die bosen:
Pylatus mit allen falschen richteren,
f. 286v Judas mit allen verrederen,
Cayn mit allen dotslegern
Meyneider, wucherer, ebrecher,
Und alle die daz nit gebusset hant,
Die koment hin zu der linckten hand.
Dar komet auch der selbe valant,
Den got mit siner hende bant.
So disz geschicht also schier,
So sint vogel fische und alle dier
Verfaren alle gemeine,
An der mensche alters eine.
Der stat vor gerichte
Vor gottes angesichte.
Dar komet daz crutze frone
Und die dornyne crone.
Longinus der zeiget da das sper,
Die engel tragent dort her
Die nagel und daz spotgewant;

113 glant P. 114 aller besten V. 115 als ob V. 116 das tal gan J. V. 117 iung gerichtz ergat V. 121 alle zů gan V. gan = gahen = O.H.G. gahun? Jellinek conjectures, alsam; Priebsch, alzu sân or allesant and refers to 269. 122 die wanting V. 123 hie wanting V. 126 allen wanting P, richter V. 128 todschlegen V, dotsleger P. 129 mainaid V, meyneide P. 130 u. weli das n. g. h. V. 131 wanting V. 132 dar komet auch wanting P, der alt lucifer V. 92 V mit allen tůflen kumet der selb valant (= P 132). 135 alle omitted P. 136 verfarn P, gemein P, gemainlich V. 138 stet P, d. s. v. dem g. V. 140 fron PV. 141 dornyn P, cron PV. 142 der omitted V, da omitted V. 144 die spottgewand V.

Got der zeyget sie mit der hant.
Sine heiligen funff wunden
Wyset er frisch und ungebunden.
Jegeliches hat einen engel da.
Der zeiget ye sa
Was man hie zu gude dut.
Der tufel zeiget ubermut,
Der engel zeiget gude gebet
Und gude werck, die man hie det:
Almusen und ruwen,
Opfern und wallen mit truwen
Und den armen lieplich enphan,
Zu der kyrchen gan,
Rechten glauben und ware mynne,
Reinen mut und gude synne,
Dorch got kuschlich leben,
Den zehenden teil zu rechte geben,
Beide zucht und wahrheit.
Der tufel auch an syme brieffe dreit:
Zauber, ketzer, spyler, wucherer, girekeit,
Steln, raub, mort, brant,
Hoffart und ubergire gewant,
Und die da iren lip verwen,
Nach unrechtem gude werben,
Hinderreden und verraden,
Und die meineyde taden.
[Cryegen, dryegen und lyegen.]
Sanct Mychael nymmet die wage in die hant,
Daz gebudet ymme der heilant.
Er wiget gezogenlichen
Armen und richen,

147 und omitted V, unverwunden V. 148 ain V. 149 iesu V, die zeigent PV. 151 wanting V, d. t. z. uber den engel u. P. 154 bichten V. 155 opfren wainen und rúwen V. 156 die V, empfachen V. 157 gachen V. 159 war sine V. 161 ze rechter leben V. 163 sinen brieffen V. 164 zoelrer k. s. gitikait V. 165, 166 = V 123 rob brant hoffart und übriges gewand. 167 omitted V, verwern P. The emendation in the text I owe to Prof. Priebsch. Cf. *Renner*, 24389 'Gezabel mit allen frawen die gern | Ir antlutz verbent und ir cleider, | Der man gar vil vindet noch leider.' Perhaps the reading of V 166 übriges gewand is also to be taken in this sense. 168 swern V. 169 hinderrede P, verratten V. 170 u. d. mainaiden V. 171 lygen P, k. l. u. t. V. Originally a marginal gloss? 172 Ste michel V. 175 den a. u. den r. V.

Er wyeget ubel und gut.
Got da nyeman kein gewalt endut:
Der ymme wirt, den hat er;
(135) Den andern nymmet Lucifer.
180 So got selber richten wil,
So hant wir sunder sorgen vil.
An dem jungsten tage
So hebet sich ein jemerliche clage,
(140) So got scheidet gar
185 Die ubeln von der rechten schar.
So dut er sinen armen wol
Und sprichet, als er von rechte sol:
'Ich grusse uch myn vil lieben kint,
(145) Die her mit ruwen komen sint.
190 Lyeben menschen, nu sehent her!
Ich bin sicherlichen der,
Der dyse grosse martel leit
Umb uch und umb alle menscheit.
(150) (a) Durch uch ward ich zerbluwen,
(b) Darzu ward ich verspuwen,
Man cronte mich mit dornen,
195 Ich ward gestochen vornen
Dorch min armen siten,
(155) Man slug mich in den ziten
f. 288r Durch hende und durch fusse:
Min dot waz nit susse!
200 Den leit ich durch dich;
Sage an! waz hast du getan durch mich?
Ich waz arme und ellende;
(160) Wan bude du mir dine hende?
Ich leit hunger und dorst.
205 Wer twug mir mynen rost?
Ich waz nacket; wer cleyte mich?

176 wiget V. 177 kainen V, en- lacking V. 178 min V, het V. 181 dan w. s. han s. v. P. 182 might also be ἀπὸ κοινοῦ. 186 s. zu d. e. s. a. w. P, s. zertůt e. sin a. wit V. 188 er sprichet P, vil wanting P, myn wanting V, liebe P. 190 nu wanting V. 191 sicherlich V. 192 marter V. V 150, 151 omitted P. (a) zerbon V. 194 durch uch c. man mich d. P. 195 bin V. 197 ain V. 199 wanting V. 201 tůn V. 202 ellend V. 203 wen V, din hend V. 204 frost V. 205 wo was min trost V.

Ich waz ellende; wer herbergte mich?
(165) Der arme mensche, waz ich.
Ir entliessent uch die armen
Durch mich lutzel erbarmen.'
So wart dan nyeman so rich, so arm,
Er wollte basz han gefarn
(170) Dan er warb off der erden.
So somet sich nit die werde
[Maria, (die waz plena gratia).]
Vor got sie schone knuwet,
Vil wol sie ymme getruwet.
(175) Alle megde vallent mit ir nyder
(Da ist kein zwyfel weder).
f. 288v Sie weinent dan vil sere
Die reinen mede here,
[Marien begynnent ir augen fliessen:
(180) Dez lobet man die susse]
Vor gode, alle die da sint.
Maria sprichet: 'gnade, vil liebes kint!
Gnade, schopfer und vatter min!
Sich zu der lieben mutter din,
(185) Sich her, din mutter, die din genas
Und doch ein reine maget waz!
Gnade, ein werck der warheit!
Gnade, uber alle selikeit!
Dyse menschen sint alle din,
(190) Du salt sie lassen geniessen min.
Die mir gedyenet hant,
Durch mich gefastet hant,
Die lip, lude, oder lant
Durch mynen willen liessen;
(195) Des lasze sie herre geniessen

207 waz P. 208 mentsch V. 209 ir liessent uch die armen durch mich V. 210 l. e. V. 211 was V, dan lacking V. 212 e. w. harte b. farn P. 213 er erwarp P, der wanting P, erde V. 187—213 From the unmotived transition from the 'Guten' to the 'Bösen' in this speech it is probable that we have here a lacuna in the MS. Cf., too, the sources, Matth. xxv, 34 ff. 215 die da ist V. The line is probably an interpolation. 216 The original probably ran: Vor got Maria knuwet. 222 begundent den ir ogen V. 223 süssen V. 222–3 certainly interpolated. 226 gnade omitted V. 228 s. here wo die m. d. d. g. V, wo also in P. 230 weg V. 231 genad ob V. 233 solt V. 235 durch min ere V. 236 die da V. 238 der P, here V.

Und lone in keyserliche,
Gib in durch mich din riche.'
Wan daz vernymmet der susse Crist
Die bede usz siner lieben mutter ist,
f. 289r (200) Er heisset sie uff stan mit der hant,
Und trostet sie der heylant.
Er sprichet: 'swig, liebe mutter min,
Du solt din weinen lassen sin.
Wer dich hat geeret,
(205) Der wirt von myr geheret
Schone in dem paradise.'
Also anwurt ir der wyse:
'Maget reyne, mutter min,
Vil selen mussent verlorn sin,
(210) Und enwer din mutterliche truwe.
Du bist mir yemer nuwe.
Und waz du hast gedacht,
Daz wirt alles vollenbracht.'
So neyget ymme die riche
(215) Vil gezogenliche
Mit allen megeden reinen.
So horet man da sere weinen
Manige sele uberlanc,
Daz sie nit auch gedyenet hant
(220) Aller tugende gymme,
Die also mit susser styme
Ir liebes kint erbieden kan!
f. 289v Waz Maria da begert, daz ist alles getan.
Sanctus Johannes Baptista,
(225) Der gat zu Christo da,
Und die zwolff botden allesant,
Sie sind nyder oder hoch genant,
Merteler, bichter,

239 keyserlich P, kaiserlichen V. 240 rich P. 241 und w. P. 242 was sin liebe můter ist V. 243 sten P, sie omitted V. 248 geeret P, gehöret V. 250 omitted V. *ἀπὸ κοινοῦ*. 251 m. můter raine V. 252 mussent omitted P, there follows in V: genussent sy nit din. 253 en omitted V. 255 und wanting P. 256 vollbracht V. 261 uberlant PV. For emendation cf. Sifrit der dorfære *ZfdA.*, VII, 118: 'da sprach die vrouwe uberlanc.' Lexer gives one other illustrative quotation. 263 tugent V, gryme P, grime V. 265 erbitten V, kam V. 267 sant V. 268 get P. 271 and 271a written as one verse in P. 271 marter V.

(a) Wissagen, eynsidel, clusener,
(230) Und alle heilige man
Sicht man da vor Cristo stan
Gar erbemecliche.
275 Sie biedent alle gliche
Umb die sundige diet.
(235) Got in der beden nit verziet.
Er sprichet: 'wer uch gedienet hat
Mit golde, mit sylber, oder mit wat,
280 Oder dorch uch ellende wart,
Oder sich durch uch mute off die fart,
(240) Wer sich dar zu mute,
Mit lybe oder mit gute,
Mit fasten oder mit ruwen,
285 Die geniessent sin mit truwen.
Die icht durch uch taden,
(245) Die sollen wir beraden
f. 290r In dem paradise schone,
Mit tusentveltigem lone,
290 Der da nommer kan zurgan.'
Er heisset die boden offstan
(250) Und alle hymmelsche kint.
Die tufel da bereidet sint
Mit furigen banden.
295 Sine menschen nymmet er zu handen,
Die da an ruwen sint komen.
(255) Eine stymme hat man vernommen,
Die sprichet frolich und ist freidenrich:
'Ir gesegenten gent in daz rich
300 Des ewigen vatters min.
Wol off! emphahent den lon sin.'
(260) Ein ander stymme komet nu da by;
Horent wie engstlichen sie sy!

271a wyssager P. 273 da omitted V. 274 erbermeclich P, erbarmklich V. 275 bittent V, glich P, gelich V. 276 dietht P, sundigen V. 277 verzicht P. 278 geeret P. 279 oder omitted V. 281 uch omitted P. 287 der selen werden beratten V. 288 schon PV. 289 lon PV. 290 gen P. 291 sten P. 292 himelschi V. 293 berait V. 294 furrinen V. 298 written as two verses in V, ist och fr. V. 299 wan got sprichet P, gott sprichett gesegnotten des vatters min V. 300 ir sond besitzen das riche min V. 301 wanting V, emphahent dann P, min P. 302 nu wanting V.

Sie sprichet: 'nu gant hin ir tufels kint,
Daz ir ummer verfluchet sint.
Ir hant not und arbeit,
Dorst, hunger, frost und alles leit,
Ir hant not die ummer ist.'
So gerichtet dann der susse Crist.
f. 290v Zu hymmel keret der riche got,
Der uns alle hat erledigot.
Da cronet er man unde wip,
Sie hant da den ewigen lip.
Die dar mit recht sint komen,
Den wirt alle not benommen.
Da ist truwe und selikeit,
Da fluet alle arbeit,
Ruwe ist da bereit,
Da enist kein hunger noch dorst;
Da enist weder mase noch rost,
Da enist kein regen noch wint,
Wann sie sint alle selig die da sint.
Da enist weder brant noch raup,
Da enist auch kein dorres laup,
Da enist kein winter noch sne,
Da sprichet nyeman: awe, awe!
Da enist weder hasz noch nyt,
Da ist die reine sommerzyt,
Da ist wunne und anders nicht,
Und alle heylsam zuversicht.
Da ist kunst, da ist crafft,
f. 291r Da ist froliche meinsterschaft,
Da ist unermesseliche zucht,
Von vochten kumet nyeman in kein flucht
Wann da wirt nyeman leydes deil.
Da ist beide selde und heil,
Dar erkennet nyeman keine not,

304 sie wanting V, sprechet V, nu gent ungewecket P. Written in P as two verses. 307 hunger wanting P, d. f. h. u. a. l. V. 309 richt V. 310 bot P. 312 und PV. 313 da wanting V. 316 trůn V. 317 da ist kain V. 319 frost V. 323 weder omitted P. 325 d. e. weder w. n. s. V. 326 mir ist we V. 331 künst P. 332 frolich P. 333 vermesseliche zit P, the scribe read v instead of v̄, mässekliche V. 334 v. f. kunde da n. i. k. sclicht P. The reading of V at least makes sense; I can make nothing of P. 336 sele P.

Da fochtet auch nyeman den dot.
Wie solte man wunschen daz!
Da ist wunsche und wunsches basz,
Und solte yeman wunschen tusent lant,
Er hette sie zu hant,
Wolte yeman lylien und rosen.
Wer mit gode frolichen wil kosen,
Und wer ummer wil selig sin,
Dem raden ich off die truwe min:
Man dyene got ane wang,
Daz ist aller wysheit anefang,
Wan der tufel mit sinen hunden,
Der kan nit wan grynen und wunden.
Sine beste freide ist leit.
Er nymmet die sundige menscheit,
Und dut sie in ein fynsters gaden.
f. 291^{v} Da nemment die selen groszen schaden:
Eine heisz, die ander kalt,
Selten jung und ummer alt.
Vil maniger hande wyse
Dut der hellen hunt so gryse:
Hie hunger, da dorst,
Eine bradet er als ein worst,
Da ist bech, da ist swebel,
Da ist ryff, da ist nebel,
Da ist weinen, da ist not,
Da ist ummer ewig tot,
Da ist kratzen, da ist byssen,
Da ist schelten, da ist verwissen,
Da ist hencken, da ist blenden,
Da ist gehonen, da ist geschenden,
Da ist leit, da ist sere,
Es wart nye konig so here,
Er wolte da ein wurm sin.

338 auch omitted V, kainen V. 339 wo V, wisen V. 340 wunsch V. 343 A reminiscence of the legend of St Dorothy? 344 und wer mit gott wil färlich k. V. 345 ummer omitted V. 349 sundern P, sundren V. For 'hellehunt' as a designation of the devil cf. Lexer 1, 1234 and our poem 358. 350 denn V, wundern P, wundren V. 352 d. arme s. P, sündigen V. 359 hungret V, türst V. 371 wölt V, ussen sin V. For the reading of V cf. 'Spiel

(330) Da ist bech der beste win,
Da ist meindat ingesinde,
Da mag der vatter syme kinde
375 Zu helffe nit komen, noch ym das kint,
f. 292r Wann sie hant alle not die da sint
(335) Nu helffe uns der megde sun,
Daz wir mussen also dun,
Daz wir sin angesiechte
380 Vor dem jungsten gerichte
Mussen sehen sicherliche.
(340) Des helffe uns got vom himelriche.
A.....M.....E.....N.

von den klugen und törichten Jungfrauen' (Fassung A) and Reuschel, *l.c.*, p. 15, note 1. Cf., also, the parallel passages collected by Singer, *Festschrift für J. von Kelle*, Prag, 1908, p. 314. 373 in gesind V. 374 kind V. 375 hilffe V. 379 aingesicht V. 380 gericht V. 381 m. sicherliche s. PV. 382 d. h. u. g. und daz hymmelsche kint P, d. h. g. der himelschlich tegen V. On the rhyme sechen : tegen cf. Kraus, *Deutsche Gedichte des* XII. *Jhs.*, Halle, 1894. II, 15. The conjecture in the text I owe to Prof. Jellinek, cf. the formal conclusion, Müllenhof und Scherer, *Denkmäler*[3], Berlin, 1892, XLVII, 4, verse 93. 383 und alle die engel die da by ym sint (wanting V), AMEN amen V.

Notes on the Text of 'Wie Got das jungst Gericht besitzen sol.'

46. From these lines it is evident that the much discussed passage from *Muspilli*, 60 (uuar ist denne diu marha, dar man dar eo mit sinen magon piehc?), does not refer to contemporary historical events.

48. *Proverbs*, xi, 4 : Non proderunt divitiae in die ultionis ; cf. also x, 2 : Nil proderunt thesauri impietatis. *Sophonias*, i, 18 : Sed et argentum eorum, et aurum eorum non poterit liberare eos in die irae Domini. *Vom jüngsten Gericht* by Frau Ava (edited by Piper, *ZfdPh.*, XIX, 304 seq.), p. 307, 107 seq. : so zerget uil sciere / da diu werlt mit ist gezieret / golt unde silber / unde ander manech wunder / nusken unde bouge / daz gesmide der frouwen / goltvas unde silber vaz / chelche unde chierch scaz / so muz daz allez zergan / daz von listen ist getan. *Barlaam und Josaphat* (edited by Pfeiffer, Leipzig, 1843), p. 95, 7 : deweder golt noch silber frumt / der an den tac mit sunden kumt. Schönbach, *Pred.*, I, 7, 17 : der richtum enmagh dir nicht gevrumen in dem tage der wrache. Ava, p. 313, 267 : da ne hilfet golt noch scaz / e bedahten wir iz baz. *Millst. Sündenkl.* (edited by Rüdiger, *ZfdA.*, XX, 255 seq.), 150 : dane hilfet die loute / silbir, noch golt daz rote, / noch miete diu maere, / noch phenninge swaere, / noch lantrecht, noch phaht. Rüdiger quotes further from Ava and from *Leben Jesu* (Diemer's edition), 265, 8 D : do buten si in ze miten / silber und golt daz rote. Cf. further : *Martina* : 191, 22 : daz golt rot, and 166, 11 daz er (Gott) an sineme gerihte phleget neheinere miete. Heinrich v. Melk (edited by R. Heinzel, Berlin, 1867), *Erinn.*, 750 : waz hilfet aller min richtum / unt manic unsaeliger gewin? and 850 : din guot dich nicht gefriden mac. *Gottes Zukunft* (edited by Singer, *Die Werke Heinrichs von Neustadt, Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters*, VII),

678, 5: Silber, golt und schone kleit / Ist alda zu nihte. *Memento mori* (MSD^3, xxx^b 13, 8 variant readings): des ne mag imo der skaz ze guote werden. *Mhd. Spiel* (Klee), 57: richtuom, adel, sper und auch schilt, / friunt, ere, sterke da nit gilt, / schaffe daz dir got werde holt, / das nützet dich für silber und gold. Otfrid, v, 19, 45: Ni losent thar in noti golt noh diuro wati / ni hilfit gotowebbi thar, noh thaz silabar in war. v, 19, 57: Thar nist miotono wiht ouh wehsales niawiht, / thaz iaman thes giwise, mit wihtu sih irlose; / Ni warthiu io so richi ubar woroltrichi, / thoh thu es thar biginnes; ther scaz ist sines sindes.

53. *Isaiae*, xiii, 10. *Ezech.*, xxxii, 7. *Joel*, ii, 10, 31. iii, 15. *Matth.*, xxiv, 29. *Marc.*, xiii, 24. *Luc.*, xxi, 25. *Mhd. Spiel*, 11: diu sunne vor im vlieset den schin / der man wirt bluotvar vor grozer pin. *Muspilli*, 54: mano vallit. *Heliand*, 4310: that wirðid her er an themu manon skin / iac an theru sunnon so same: giswerkad siu beðiu, / mid finistre werðad bifangan; fallad sterron, / huit hebentungal.

63. *Matth.*, xxiv, 31: Et mittet angelos suos cum tuba, et voce magna; et congregabunt electos ejus a quatuor ventis, a summis caelorum usque ad terminos eorum. *Marc.*, xiii, 27. *I Corin.*, xv, 52. *Elucidarium*, 1164: ita angeli ad hoc constituti. This idea is continually represented in the plastic arts, cf. Voss, *l.c.*, p. 17 seq.; cf., too, the trumpets of *Apoc.* viii, 6 seq. though it is true that here seven are mentioned. The combination of this passage with the one quoted above from *Matth.*, xxiv may possibly have resulted in the conception accepted in our text. *Mhd. Spiel*, 231: die vier engel mit grozem zorn / ruofen denn herzuo mit dem herhorn. Mone (*Schauspiele des Mittelalters*, I Band, Karlsruhe, 1846), p. 319: den blasent vier engel rich / vier horn gar arschrokenlich; 279 Dann zehand blausent si uf die vier horn mit grimme. Griesh. *Pred.*, I, p. 139: wan got der sendet an dem iungesten tage sine engel uz. und die blasent mit ieren herhornen uber alle die welte..... Bruder Wernher (Wackernagel, *Kirch. L.*, II, 70 Nr. 101): die engel blasent uf ir horn ze jungest. H. Sachs, 419, 33: Nachdem er heizt zu angesicht / Die ertzengel aufblasen geschwindt / Unter dem himel durch die vier windt. *Martina*, 202*c*, 64: Daz ist daz gottis herhorne / Daz die toten ufwecket..... *Erlösung* (edited by K. Bartsch, 1858), 6263: die engel blasent do ir horn. *Muspilli*, 73: so daz himilisca horn kihlutit wirdit. *Sibillen Boich*: So wie dat unser here Jesus sin lest ordel dat erschrecklich is allen creaturen halden sal in dem dale Josaphat (709—768). (O. Schade, *Geistl. Ged. des XIV. und XV. Jh. vom Niderrhein*, Hannover, 1854.) Cf. especially 713: die zwelf apostel brengt he mit im dair / Und der engel vil manich schair / Die engel blasen up die basunen mit grimme. *Colmarer Hs.* Bartsch. (Stuttg. Lit. Verein. vol. LXVIII) S. 588, 75: Die stimm die sol wir alle hoeren an: / ez sint vier horn in grimmiclichen don. Otfrid, v, 19, 25: Thaz ist ouh dag harnes joh engilliches galmes.

75, 84—106. *Daniel*, xii, 2. *Hesekiel*, xxxvii, 12. *Joh.*, v, 28.

84. Grieshaber, I, p. 140: Surgite mortui et venite ad judicium. Si sprechent stant uf ir toten und koment ze gerichte fur den zornigen richter. *Muspilli*, 79: denne varant engila uper dio marha / wechant deota, wissant ze dinge. Freidank *Bescheidenheit* (edited by Bezzenberger, Halle, 1872), 179, 16: dar nach sol diu werlt erstan, / ze stunt daz urteil muoz ergan. *Mhd. Spiel*, 133: [nu stant uf ir toten liute, / ze gerichte müezent ir hiute!] Hesler, *Apok.*, 20162: Swenne Got unser trechten / Tut blasen Michaelen / Allen seligen selen / Und alle toten wecken, / So sich die grab entecken / Und entsliezen kegen der stimme, / Wen die wirt geblasen mit grimme, / So gebutet Got vier winden, / Die sich in vier enden vinden / Der werlde, daz sie blasen / Allen vorvulten asen; / Swaz ie zu menschen wart geschaft, / Daz samnet sich von Gotes craft / Al zu samene an ein gestob, / Daz niekein wart also grob. Otfrid, v, 20, 25: Thie selbe irstantent alle fon thes lichamen falle, / fon themo fulen legere, iro werk zi irgebanne, / Uz fon thern asgu, fon thern falawisgu, / so wanne soso iz werde, fon themo irdisgen herde.

107. *Elucidarium*, 1165 D: qui hic habuerunt bina capita, vel plura membra, vel quibus defuerunt aliqua, aut pingues, aut macri fuerunt, resurgent tales? M. qui hic habuerunt duo capita, duo inde corpora resurgent, et unaquaeque anima habebit suum corpus, cui nihil indecens vel deforme adhaerat, sed omnia membra sana et integra, et omni pulchritudine plena habuit. *Martina*, p. 502, 199^{b}52: Ane gebresten der nature, cf. 300^c seq.

113. *Elucidarium*, 1171 : Porro illorum speciositas erit ut solis claritas, ut dicitur : Fulgebunt justi sicut sol (Matth. xiii, 43) qui tunc septuplo plus quam nunc fulgescet. Ava, p. 309, 170 : die guoten sint dem sunnen gelich. *Martina*, p. 498, 79 : Die muozen schone unde ganz / Werden als der sunnen glanz (referring to purgatory). Grieshaber, I, 153 : sich da ist ain iegelicher rainer mensch der och nach dem iungsten tage reht als schön und als clar wirt als diu edel sunne. Un da von sprichet S. Anshelmus. In illa vita pulchritudo iustorum solis pulchritudini quum (cui ?) septempliciter quam modo sit splendor erit adequabitur. Cf. Schönbach, II, 14, 23. *Bescheidenheit*, 179, 14 : dar nach suln die erwelten sin / noch liechter dan der sunnen schin.

115. *Elucidarium*, 1164 D : Resurgent.....qua erant, si essent triginta annorum ; vel futuri essent, nisi ante morerentur. 1165 C : ita Cristus in ea forma qua ascendit cum ordinibus angelorum ad judicium veniet. *Ephes.*, iv, 13 : in mensuram aetatis. *Erlösung*, 6280 : si koment alle sament dar / alle idoch also gefar, / wie hie die lute waren / biz ir drizic jaren. *Martina*, p. 502, 65 : und daz alter daz uf erde / hatte ihesus crist der werde, cf. Schönbach, III, 76, 36. For further quotations see Wadstein, *l.c.*, p. 65 and Note 1. Cf. also *Gottes Zukunft*, 6190 : Die toden muoszen uf sten / und fur den rechten richter gen / Gantz und ungeteilet, / Unverhaltzet und ungemeilet / ...6198 : recht als Crist wart gestalt / Da er waz drissig jar alt. Cf., too, *Vom Rechte* (Waag, *Kleinere Deutsche Ged. des XI. und XII. Jh.*, Halle, 1890, VIII), 374 seq. which, however, does not quite correspond.

116. The valley of Jehoshaphat is universally mentioned as the scene of the last judgment. Cf. *Elucidarium*, 1165 : Erit judicium in valle Josaphat ? Vallis Josaphat dicitur vallis judicii. In valle ergo fit judicium, id est in isto mundo.

118. *I Corinth.*, vi, 2 : An nescitis quoniam sancti de hoc mundo judicabunt ? *Elucidarium*, 1166 D : Qui sunt qui judicant ? M. Apostoli, martyres, confessores, monachi, virgines.

126. *Renner* (Bamberg, 1833–4. Ehrismann's new edition in the Publ. of the Stutt. Lit. Ver. has only appeared to line 16966), 24375 (quoted already by Wadstein, *l.c.*, p. 72) : So kumpt chayn mit allen mordern, / und mit allen valschen zehendenern, / und darnach Judas mit allen verratern / darnach kunk pylat mit valschen richtern..... *Erlösung*, 6506 : Wa sit ir nu her Judas / her Cahin und her Caiphas, / her Phebus und her Jupiter.....ir rouber und nahtbrennere / ir morder und ir diebe. Cf. Bartsch's note to line 6506. *Künzelsauer Fronleichnamsspiel* (quoted by Reuschel, p. 142) : Judas und alle sin genasz / dy iren nebencristen haben veratten.....Pylatus mit allen falschen richtern. / Cayn komt mit allen mordern. *Gottes Zukunft*, 6370 : Wo sint ir nů her Judas ? 6381 : Ez sint Judas vil alda. Priebsch, *Bruchstücke des Ged. vom Jüngsten Gericht*, Add. 34392 British Museum (*Deutsche Hss. in England*, Erlangen 1896, 1901), II, p. 271, 2ª, 10 : schergen und richteren, / wuchereren und sazzungeren / ...diebe und die valschen kouf hant / ...alle die meineide habent gesworn / unde alle manslechte... / ...spileren und trinkeren... / ...alle die lugene gesait hant etc.

133. Answering to *II Petri*, ii, 4. *Judä*, vi and *Apocal.*, xx, 2. As regards the plastic arts see Voss, *l.c.*, p. 21.

134. *Summa Theologiae* (*M.S.D*³., XXXIV), 3 : der (Gott) gibundin hat den diuval. Otfrid, IV, 12, 64 : in bant inan (den Teufel) gilegiti, er furdir uns ni deriti.

140. A commonly accepted notion, already found in the *Muspilli*. As regards its origin, see Wadstein, *l.c.*, p. 37 and Note 3, also Schönbach's Note to p. 193 (II) : '*Matth.* xxiv, 30 : et tunc parebit signum Filii hominis in coelo ; immer auf das Kreuz ausgelegt, auch in der Predigt bei Wernher, *Deflorationes*...Migne 157, 740 B : signum intellige crucem aut vexillum victoriae.' Cf. *Elucidarium*, 1165 C : angeli crucem ejus ferentes praecibunt. For the plastic arts cf. Wadstein, *l.c.*, p. 45 and Note 5 ; this notion is also to be found in the drama, see Reuschel, p. 145. *Renner*, 24400 : kommen sin engel und bringen her / besem, nagel, krone und daz sper, / mit den er gemartert wart. Hoffmann's *Fundgruben*, I, 200, 9 ; II, 131, 1 ; II, 135, 5. Ava, p. 309, 171 : die engel uorent scone / daz cruce und die corone. *Martina* (p. 520), 206ᶜ, 60 : (crist lat...spehin) siner marter waffen, / Daz siu die sunder straffen, / Die geiseln und die crone / Darzuo daz cruce frone / ...daz sper...die scharpfe nagel. *Muspilli*, 100 : wirdit denne furi kitragan daz frono chruci, dar der heligo Christ

ana arhangan ward. Grieshaber, I, 152 : dc ist dc hailige cruce, dc ist dc sper dc im gestochen wart durch sin siten dc sint die nagel...durnen crone...spaichille...geisela. Hesler, *Apok.*, 19886 : Die engele die dar zu sin geschaft / Die vuren einen liechten schin, /Als iz ein cruce dunke sin, / Vor im. Schönbach, II, 11, 8 : die heiligen engel die bringent auch dar daz here chraeutze, cf. II, 90, 33. Hans Sachs, 419, 27 : Christus... mit seinen engeln gar / Die im furen das creutz voron / die negel, spär, gaisel und cron. Cf. the further quotations in Wadstein, *l.c.*, 45, Note 5, pp. 51, 37 and Note 3. Also Schönbach, II, Note to p. 193. Also Reuschel, p. 145 : 'Die Zerbster Prozession bot ein Bild von Matth. xxv, 31...ein Engel mit Christi Marterwerkzeugen.' *Gottes Zukunft*, 6385 : Daz crûce und die krone, / Daz sper und der wunden meil, / Geiseln, besem und daz seil / Und wo mit Crist gesmehet wart, / Daz wirt gezeiget an der vart. 7330 : Cruce, nagel und sper. *Erlösung*, 6259 : sin cruce nagel und daz sper / und ouch sin dornen krone / erschinet da gar schone. *Mhd. Spiel*, 333 : da wirt gesehen daz kriuze breit, / da got den herten tot an leit / daz sper, daz im sin herz durchstach, / daz Maria sin muoter wol sach, / diu krone und die nagel groz : / daz siht man allez sament bloz. *Fundgruben*, II, 102 (Linzer Entecrist) : mit der durninin croni / ouget er daz cruce frone, / daz sper unt diu spongia / werdent ouch irzeigit da (already quoted by Klee, p. 34).

145. Ava, p. 312, 243 : er zeiget in sine wunden / an den uuzen unde an den henden / uil harte si bluotent. *Martina* (p. 530), 205, 55 : Crist lat da ane smeichen / Aller siner wunden zeichen / Die sunder offenlichen sehin / Und den grozin kumber sehin / Den er nach menschlichen sitten / Dur die welt hat erlitten. *Gottes Zukunft*, 6451 : Seht die grozen zeichen an / Die durch min hende sind erslagen / Und durch min fusse. 7731 : Die funf wunden zeigt er. *Die Hochzeit* (Waag, IX), 723 : da lat got manege vrouwen / sine wunden schouwen, / in sinem heizmuote / berunnen al mit bluote / zallen vieren enden / in fuozzen joch in henden, / einen stich durch sine situn. *Muspilli*, 102 : denne augit er dio masun dio er in deru menniski... / dio er duruh desse mancunnes minna. *Vom Glauben* (edited by Massmann, *Deutsche Ged. des XII. Jhs.*, I), 1580 : so wiset er sine wunden, / die er an deme cruce leit. *Mhd. Spiel*, 296 : wan Jesus Cristus herab kumt / und wil lan sehen sin wunden groz. *Fundgr.*, II, 102 ff. (Linzer Entechrist) : offin stant sine wundin / er zeiget sie unverbundin (quoted, too, by Klee, p. 34).

151 ff. Schönbach, II, 147, 12 : da choment die übeln geist die uns verraten habent und rûgent uns, daz si uns mit in ze den ewigen ungenaden fürent. Cf. note p. 290.

153 ff. Ava, p. 310, 203 ff. : doch wil ich uch sagen da bi, / wie der leben sol getan sin : / si sulen got minnen / ..... / si sulen warheit phelegen, / ir almuosen wol geben, / mit mazen ir gewant tragen / ..... / si sulen ze chirchen gerne gan etc. *Muspilli*, 97 : uzzan er iz mit alamusanu furimegi / enti mit fastun dio virina kipuazti.

163. *Elucid.* 1167 : Quid est quod dicitur, 'Libri aperti sunt ; et liber vitae, et judicati sunt mortui de his quae erant scripta in libris? (*Apoc.*, xx, 12).' Libri sunt prophetae, sunt apostoli, sunt alii perfecti. Voss, *l.c.*, p. 11, refers also to *Exodus*, xxii, 33 ; *Psalm*, xlix, 29 ; *Daniel*, xii, 1 ; vii, 10 ; *Luc.*, x, 20. On the Book of Life in the plastic arts see Voss, *l.c.*, p. 11, and Wackernagel, *ZfdA.*, VI, 149. *Fundgruben*, II (v), p. 136, 6 : So dut man uf die buch / do ane stet unsir dat / si si ubil odir gut. *Millst. Sündenk.*, 333 : mine manege missetat / Lucifer si gescriben hat / und wil die briefe bringen / zu dinem tagedinge. *Muspilli*, 69 : der (der tiuval) hapet in ruovu rahono uueliha, / daz der man er enti sid upiles kifrumita, / daz er iz allaz kisaget, denne er ze suonu quimit. *Mhd. Spiel*, 273 : Der tiufel hat sich vermezzen, / er welle da niht vergezzen : / swaz der mensch hat getan, / daz wil er nit verborgen lan : / gedenke, wort, werk sint geschriben, / diu geschrift ist nit vertriben ; / swaz in der vinsteri ist volbraht, / des wirt dan offenliche gedaht. Cf. Walther von der Vogelweide's famous *Spruch* : Fro Werlt, ir sult dem wirte sagen / daz ich im gar vergolten habe ; / Min groziu gulte ist abe geslagen ; / daz er mich von dem brieve schabe.

169. *Mhd. Spiel*, 607 : hinderrede und valsche eide.

172. *Job*, xxxi, 6 : Appendat me in statera justa... *Daniel*, v, 27 : Thecel, appensus es in statera, et inventus es minus habens. The 'weighing of souls'

was one of the most popular subjects of the plastic arts and one which has found the finest expression. The 'motif' is by no means restricted to Christian art, see Voss, *l.c.*, p. 27. St Michael has always been generally considered as the Lord of souls, cf. Reuschel (Dissert.), p. 21 ; cf., too, the Rheinauer Paulus (Kraus, *Deutsche Gedichte*, II), 124, and the note where further examples are cited, cf. *Martina*, 198[d], 99. Cf., too, Schönbach, I, 77, 41 and note ; Reuschel, p. 144. It seemed very natural to connect both these notions, and the result is St Michael in a new dignity as 'keeper of the scales.'

184. The separation of the good from the evil after *Matth.*, XXV, 32, 33. Ava, p. 311, 234 : sceidet.....die guten ze der zesewen.....die ubeln ze der winsteren. *Barlaam*, 91 : die stant ze siner zesewen hant.....die ubeln.....die stant ze siner winstern da. Grieshaber, I, 140 : so stellet er die erwelten ze der gerehten hant und die ferdampnoten ze der linggen hant. Schönbach, II, 14, 10 : so werdent die rehten ze der zeswen hant gestellet, die übeln ze der tenken hant, cf. also II, 36, 25. *Fundgruben*, II, 138, 12 : So get ez an ein scheidin / so get ez an ein weinin. *Millst. Sündenk.*, 170 : so werdent da gescheiden / die lieben von den leiden, / die saelegen ze der zeswen, / die sint die genesnen / bi ewigen gnaden (Rüdiger in his note quotes further examples) ; 177 : geschichtet die leiden sa / ...vil verre ze der winstere. Somewhat different ; *Himmel. Jerusal.* (Waag VII) : 405 si ne choment nicht ze der winsteren. *Vom Glauben*, 1598 : da werden gescheiden / die liebin von den leidin : / di guten zoder zeswen / daz sint di genesenen, / di da zo der winster sint gestellet, / di varent in di hele. *Bescheidenheit*, 180, 2 : also schiere sint gescheiden / die lieben von den leiden, / so ist an ende iemer me / den guoten wol, den boesen we. *Mhd. Spiel*, 117 : ze der linken hant sint die sünder uberal (cf. the variant readings) ; 353 : die guoten zuo der rehten siten, / da sont sie himelriches biten, / die boesen zuo der linken stan / und den in die helle gan ; 367 : lieben engel ir sont scheiden / die guoten von den leiden, / füerent die guoten ze der rechten hant, / ...die leiden zuo der linken stellent. Hesler, *Apok.*, 20191 : So werde wir gescheiden, / Die lieben von den leiden. *Heliand*, 4388 : Than skeðid he thea farduanan man, / thea faruuarhton uueros an thea uuinistron hand : / so duot he ok thea saligon an thea suiðeron half ; 4444 : skeðit that uuerod an tue, / thea godun endi thea ubilon. Otfrid, v, 20, 31 : Thie sceidit er in war min iagiwedarhalb sin.

194. *Gottes Zukunft*, 6443 : Ich leit für uch smehen spot, / Ich wart für uch gefangen, / Geslagen und gehangen... 6448 : Verurteilt und gebünden.

200. *Renner*, 24406 : ditz han ich durch iuch erliden / welch sunde habt ir durch mich vermiden ? Cf. Wadstein, p. 30 ; Reuschel, pp. 100, 109, where further examples are quoted.

201. After *Matth.*, XXV, 42. The poet omits the question to the blessed.

202. Ava, p. 312, 250 : ir ne gabet mir trincken noch ezzen, / selede noch gewate. *Gottes Zukunft*, 6405 : Hüngerig bin ich geseszen, / Ir gabt mir nit zeszen ; / Ich waz dorstig und krang, / Ir teiltent mir nit uwern drang ; / Ich waz nacket und bloz, / Min armut waz unmazen groz.... 6414 : Ir gebodent mir nie uwer hende ; / Ich waz gar ellende, / Daz ir mich nit herbergtent do. *Bescheidenheit*, 178, 14 : mich hungerte, mich durste, ich was gast, / iuwer helfe mir dar zuo gebrast. / Ich was siech und nacket gar, / miner armuot namt ir kleine war / in dem kerker ich gevangen lac, / irn trost mich weder naht noch tac. *Mhd. Spiel*, 555 : von hunger leit ich groze not, / ir woltent mir nie geben brot ; / mich durste vaste ze menger stunt, / ir tranktent mir nie minen munt ; / ich gienc ellende und wislos, / mich ze herbergen iuch vaste verdroz ; / ich gienc bloz ane gewant, / mich bedahte nie iuwer hant. Priebsch, II, p. 270, 1[a], 10 : so sprichet her ich was ein gast / herberge mir bi v gebrast / von hungere durste was ich cranc / ir gabet mir ezzen noch den tranc / gekerkert siech und cleider bar / ir namet min vil cleine war. *Heliand*, 4423 : huand gi mi ni hulpun, than mi hunger endi thurst / uuegde te uundrun efthа ik geuuadies los / geng iamermod, uuas mi grotun tharf, / than ni habde ik thar enige helpe, than ik geheftid uuas, / an liðokospun bilokan, eftha mi legar bifeng, / suara suhti : than ni uueldun gi min siokes thar / uuison mid uuihti : ni uuas iu uuerð eouuiht, / that gi min gehugdin. Otfrid, v, 20, 105 : Ni buaztut ir mir, thaz ist war, thurst inti hungar, / ir mih ouh ni wattut, in siuchi drost ni datut ; / Ob ih ouh irsturbi, ni was, ther mih bidulbi ; / in hus mih ouh ni leittut joh mammuntes ni beittut.

208. *Mhd. Spiel*, 576: der arme mensch, daz (variant reading der) was ich. Priebsch, II, 270, 1ª, 14: die armen lute daz was ich.

215. Mone, 676 (stage direction): denn wirt unser liebe frow bewegt mit erbermd und stät uf, und nimpt die helgen 12 potten, und stät für unseren heren und spricht zů irem vil lieben kind, und bitt für den sunder, als hie nach stant. Cf. the variants in the critical notes of Klee's edition, line 713. The same scene is found in the *Künzelsauer Fronleichnamsspiel* (Reuschel, p. 143). *Gottes Zukunft*, 7020—7303 (quoted by Klee, p. 53). *Spiel von den klugen und thörichten Jungfrauen* (version B), 429: Liebes kint, la dich myner bede nit verdriessen, / lass hude unser trehen vor din augen fliessen / unde gedencke an daz ungemach, / daz von diner martel mir geschach... In version B St Mary reminds Christ that she is his mother, the mother of God: Eya libes kint myn, nů ben ich doch dy můtir dyn, und gedenke...Cf. Reuschel, p. 9, and Klee, p. 53 seq. In the *Wartburgkrieg* St Mary is unsuccessful in her intercession (Simrock, No. 60), see Reuschel (Dissert.), p. 32. The Virgin is mentioned in this connection in a notice of the procession of 1574 (München); but not in the Freiburger (i. Br.) *Fronleichnamsspiel* from the end of the 16th cent. See Reuschel, p. 145 seq. Cf. Konrad von Würzburg (Wackernagel, *Kirchenlied*, II), 136: Wie mac ungenade uns iemer von dime edelen sun geschehen, / so du in last din brüstel sehen / unt er dich sine wunden? (Quoted, too, by Reuschel, *l.c.*, p. 118. Two further Latin examples in the Note 4.) Cf. *Von den fünf Farben Christi*: Zöyge im die blecken brust din / die er hat in dem munde sin (H. v. Sachsenheim, *gold. Tempel* 249, 541). This latter trait, *i.e.* that of the Virgin showing Our Lord her breasts as a means of intercession (evidently an amplification of *Luke*, xi, 27) was a common subject for painters; it is to be found in an altar-piece in Cologne cathedral, also in a painting by Rubens in the Royal Gallery of Ancient Pictures at Brussels (Catalogue, No. 376). There is a similar picture in the Musée Communal at Bruges.

The origin of this idea, of the intervention of the Virgin Mary on behalf of the wicked at the Last Judgment, is not quite clear. In all probability the plastic arts here exerted their influence, but it is not known where the latter, for their part, derived the subject, for it would seem that literature is the precursor of the plastic and pictorial arts. It has been suggested that certain hymns, especially a widely popular one on St Mary and St John made their influence felt in this direction. Cf. Voss, *l.c.*, p. 43 sqq., whose views Reuschel accepts (cf. the latter's dissertation, p. 24, and his book, pp. 117 seq., 203). I would also draw attention to the German *Mariensequenzen* and *Sündenklagen* where St Mary's intercession with her Son is invariably invoked. Cf. Waag, *Deutsche Gedichte*, X, 120 seq., 187 seq.; XII, 174 seq.; XV, 97 seq.; XVII, 57 seq. I may also refer to the following interesting parallels from *Mariengrüssen* (*ZfdA.*, VIII, 297 seq.). Line 763: Hilf uns vrouwe, an dem bittern / tage, da die übeln zittern / (sagt diu schrift), alda got rihtet, / alliu dinc nach rehte slihtet. Cf. also line 465: Vreuwe dich, vrouwe! du gebiutest / dinem sun, den du wol triutest / bit got, gebiute dinem kinde / daz unser wize werden linde. Or, again, cf. Bartsch, *Colmarer Hs.*, p. 589, 93: Maria, durch dins kindes bluot / sins zornes amblic mach uns guot, / behüet uns vor der helle gluot, / nim unser selen war.

Klee (*l.c.*, p. 49 seq.) has endeavoured to trace the origin of this notion of the Virgin's intercession for the wicked at the Last Day. He finds the earliest mention of the idea in Alcuin's works. But as the chief starting-point for all subsequent notices he regards a sermon of Berthold von Regensburg's (edited by Schönbach, *Über eine Grazer Hs. lateinisch-deutscher Predigten*, Graz, 1890, p. 74), where St Mary appears as mediatrix, but has her plea refused. Klee is of the opinion that the introduction of St John as co-interceder followed as a matter of course. St John, he says, was already closely associated with St Mary in the fourth Gospel, and with the Fathers of the Church, the combination was a favourite one. But the conclusive step in this direction as far as medieval German literature is concerned, Klee holds to have been taken by the author of the *Spiel von jüngsten Tage*. And this *Spiel*, according to Klee, arose under the influence of a painting (reproduced by E. aus'm Weerth in his book *Wandmalereien des christlichen Mittelalters in den Rheinlanden*, Leipzig, 1879) where St Mary and St John are

represented as co-interceders. This hypothesis may be correct in many respects, but there seems to be a certain confusion here between St John the Evangelist and St John the Baptist, a fact which Klee has already noticed himself (cf. Note 2 to p. 157). It is true that the medieval sources themselves did not always discriminate very carefully between them (cf. the extract from *Gottes Zukunft* quoted below). St John the Baptist is, however, the usual interceder on behalf of the wicked. He was universally considered as the patron saint of all repentant sinners; cf. Scherer, *Quellen und Forschungen*, XII, 69, and the following passage from *Johannes Baptista* (Kraus, *Deutsche Gedichte*, IV, 266): iohannes můzh unser voget sin / in iudicio domini. St Mary and St John seem to play a similar role in a miniature of the *Erlösung* MS. described by Bartsch in his note to 6276: 'auf der Erde knien anbetend einerseits Maria, andrerseits Johannes der Täufer.'

255. *Gottes Zukunft*, 7182: Maria frauwe, můter min! / Waz du bidest, daz sol sin.

267. *Gottes Zukunft*, 7176: Johannes baptista, / Und Johannes ewangelista / Triben auch die bet an / Die Maria hat getan. *Mhd. Spiel*, 751: (St John intercedes for the sinners; cf. also the variant readings to 713, where Johannes appears in L and B).

269. *Matth.*, xix, 28: sedebitis et vos super sedes duodecim, judicantes duodecim tribus Israel; cf. also *Luc.*, xxii, 30; *I Cor.* vi, 2, 3; *Jude*, 14, 15. *Martina*, p. 522, 207c, 60: uf zwelf stuolen sitzin. *Gottes Zukunft*, 6844: Mit gewalt und mit witzen / Sult ir schon besitzen / Zwelf stul herlich. *Die Hochzeit*, 955: ich lazze iuch ze jungist / for aller miner christenheit stan / unde lazze iuch wesen zware / ir urtailaere / ubir diu zwelf chünne / der Jacobis chinde. Wackernagel, *Pred.*, p. 182, 28: Und si sönd sitzzen uf dien zwelf stuelen und sönd richten mit dien zwelfbotten über die zwelf geslecht von ysrahel.

271. Schönbach, III, 235, 40: gots erwelten...die heiligen zwelfpoten...maertaere... pichtegaere...choment mit dem himilisken kunige an daz sin gerihte unde ertailent da mit samt im uber die armen sundaeren. Klee, *l.c.*, p. 37, refers also to Wackernagel, *Pred.* LVIII, p. 155, 33, and LVIII, p. 154, 18. Cf. Schönbach, III, 267, 1 seq. *Summa Theologiae*: 27, 9: di durchnachtig in sulin irdeilin. *Gottes Zukunft*, 6958: daz sint die mertelaere, / Die heiligen bihtigaere / Und die reinen jůngfrauwen. *Mhd. Spiel*, 971: Maria liebiu muoter min, / du solt nemen die megede din, / die engel und die zwelf boten, / die martaere und die bichtaere guot, / ...nim ze dir die heiligen alle. Hesler, *Apok.*, 18320: 'set, unser herre komet / Und alle sine heiligen mit eme.' *Micha*, i, 3.

278. *Elucidarium*, 1166: Qui sunt qui judicabuntur? Qui opera misericordiae in legitimo conjugio exercuerunt, vel qui peccata sua poenitentia et eleemosynis redemerunt, eis dicetur: Venite, benedicti etc. (Matth. XXV, 34).

293. Ava, p. 312, 255: Da ist der tievel uon helle / mit manageme sinem gesellen / so uahet er die armen / uil lutzel si im erbarment / mit chetenen unde mit seilen / er bindet si algemeine (quoted, too, by Wadstein, p. 49, see Note 1, where further parallels will be found). Heinrich von Melk, *Erinn.*, 816: der (der Teufel) hat si also lebentige gesäilet / mit siner girischaite beien. Slightly different *Erinn.*, 710: diu cheten der gotes rache / hat mich starche gebunden, cf. further parallels quoted by Heinzel in his note to 710. Cf. *Priesterleben*, 718: man beginnet si stetenen / in fiurine chetenen. *Millst. Sündenkl.*, 195: wan mit viurinen bandon / beginnet er si binden / in fuozzen joch in handen. Further parallels in the notes. *Die Hochzeit* (Waag, IX), 762: den got da verteilet / unde in der viant geseilet. *Himmel und Hölle* (*M.S.D.*, XXX), 131: diu vreissamen dotbant. *Geistliche Dicht.* (Bartsch, *Erlösung*), XXXII, *Seele und Leichnam*, 543: (p. 326) etlicher sie mit rimen pant / zusamen gar gesmucket. *Mhd. Spiel*, 252: der tiuvel muoz sie seilen / und füeren in der helle grunt. 691: Nu wol uf! ich wil iuch seilen. 702: der tiuvel hat mich geseilet. Klee (p. 40) quotes other parallel passages. This is another instance of the influence of the plastic arts on literature. Cf. Wadstein, p. 49, Note 1.

299. *Matth.*, XXV, 34: Tunc dicet rex his, qui a dextris ejus erunt: Venite benedicti Patris mei, possidete paratum vobis regnum a constitutione mundi. Ava, p. 311, 229: zu dem sprihet der gotesun: / var ze miner zeswen! / 'uenite benedicti,

mines uater riche ist iu gerichtet.' *Barlaam*, 91, 35: koment her, erwelten min! / daz riche iu sol bereitet sin. *Martina*, p. 524, 208ª, 22: Er sprichet: ir gesegenotten / Koment her min erwelten / Ze frouden ungezelten / In mines vatter riche. Grieshaber, I, 140: koment her ir gesegenoten und besizzent dc riche minez vater. dc iu von angenge der welte ist beraitet. Schönbach, I, 199, 1 a; II, 103, 39; II, 173, 11. *Renner*, 24431. *Fundgruben*, II, 136, 40. *Millst. Sündenk.*, 258: wol ir miniu liebiu chint, /...nu get in daz himelriche, / da ir sullet twellen. *Summa Theol.* (MSD. XXXIV), 30, 1: Saligin di zi der zeswin sint / immere gotis kint. *Gottes Zukunft*, 7478: Kümpt mit mir! ir sint gesegent, / Mit voller gnaden uberregent / Von dem hohen vater min. / Ir sült iemer bi mir sin / In gantzer freuden glich / Enphaht hie daz rich / Daz uch ewig ist bereit. *Vom Rechte* (Waag, VIII), 539: er heizzet si elliu siniu chint, / die daz reht wurchunde sint, / er heizzet si varen geliche / ze sines vater riche, / gewihet joch gesegenot. *Erlösung*, 6543: ir frunt ir kint ir lieben man, / die minen willen hant getan, / get ir solent froude emphan / in mines vater riche, / daz uch ist ewicliche / uf geleget und bereit / in also ganzer stetikeit / sint dem anbeginne. *Bescheidenheit*, 179, 24: die minen willen hant getan, / die suln mins vater riche han. Hesler, *Apok.*, 20312: Komet gesegenten mines vater! / Besitzet daz riche / Immer ewicliche, / Daz uch vor dem beginne / Bereitet ist in mime sinne. Priebsch, II, p. 272, 2ᵇ, 22: got himelriches gimme. der sol mit siner stimme. sprechen herzeliebe kint. wan sie gebenediet sint. die min vater gesegent hat. kvmet her und enphat. mines vater riche. daz ist v ewicliche. bereitet mit der engele schar. ich wil vch kronen kvmet har. Tilo von Kulm, *Von siben Ingesigelen* (edited by Kochendörffer, *Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters*, vol. IX, 1907), 6231: 'Kumet in mins vater rich, / Ir gebenedieten glich, /...6240 Nu kumt vrolich czu genaden / Mines vater und enphat / Vroude di nicht me czurgat!.' *Heliand*, 4392: 'kumad gi,' quiðid he, 'the thar gikorene sindun endi antfahad thit craftiga riki, / that gode, that thar gigereuuid stendid, that thar gumono barnum / giuuarht fan thesaro ueroldes endie: iu habad geuuihid selbo / faðer allaro firiho barno: gi motun thesaro frumono neotan, / geuualdon theses uuidon rikeas.' Otfrid, V, 20, 67: Quemet', quit er thara zi in, 'thie giwihte mines fater sin, / giseginote sine, joh liabun druta mine; / Intfahet, thaz er worahta, richi, thaz er garota / er anagengi worolti er iuih thara holoti'!

303. Grieshaber, 140: darnach so sprichet er ze den die ze der linggen hant sint: Discedite a me maledicti in ignem eternum qui est paratus diabolo. Er sprichet gant von mir ier ferfluchten in dc ewige fiur dc iu un dem tiefel ist berait. Reuschel, p. 101, quotes from MS. B of the *Spiel vom Jungsten Tage* (The Donaueschingen-Rheinauer Type), 863: Dauon gondt hin, ir uerfluochten kindt! / Wan ir sindt gewesen plyndt. Cf. further: *Gottes Zukunft*, 6937: Ite maledicti, / Gent ir verfluchten, / Mit gnaden unberuchten! 7342 Gent ir verfluchten, / An gnaden unberuchten. *Erlösung*, 6533: get ir verfluchten hin / in daz fur, in daz leit, / daz uch ist ewiclich bereit. *Bescheidenheit*, 179, 26: so müezen die verfluochten varn / zer helle mit des tiuvels scharn. *Heliand*, 4419: 'nu gi fan mi sculun,' qui it he, / 'faran so forflocane an that fiur euuig, / that thar gigareuuid uuarð godes andsacun, / fiundo folke be firinuuerkun.' Priebsch, p. 270, 1ª, 16: da vone get in der helle tot. get hin virvluchten libe. von mir ich uch vir tribe. in daz vur daz bereitet ist...vil arme sunder genc von mir, trost und genade virsage ich dir. kere hin von den ougen min. min antlitze wirt dir nimmir schin. scheide dich von mineme riche. *Von siben Ingesigelen*, 6245: 'Get, vervluchten, ungehuer / In daz ewicliche vuer!' Otfrid, V, 20, 99: 'firwazen ir fon gote sit; / faret fon therera suazi in thaz ewiniga wizi!' etc.

304. On this formula cf. Kraus, *Deutsche Gedichte*, VII, 4, 1. In addition to the examples he quotes cf. one from Schönbach, II, 21: daz sint des tiufels kint (said of the Babylonians).

313. Ava, p. 315, 335: michel wunne...statige iugende...tugende...starcke craft ...daz ewige lieht...neheines sichtuomes niht...wunescapht.. chuneclich ere. *Millst. Sündenk.*, 238: da ist liep unde lieht, / da ist dehein ungenade nieht. / da ist minne ane nit, / da ist vroude ane strit, / da ist lip ane tot, / da ist genade ane not / dane ist vrost noch hungir, / dane brennet si diu sunne, / dane altet nieman, / wan si schulen immir jugent han. / Da ist dehein angist: / der engele sanges / vrowent sich datz himile /

alle die menege. Cf. further parallels in the notes. *Muspilli*, 14: dar ist lip ano tod, lioht ano finstri / selida ano sorgun: dar nist neoman siuch. / denne der man in pardisu pu kiuuinnit, / hus in himile, dar quimit imo hilfa kinuok. Grau, *l.c.*, p. 82, cites a long passage from Leyser, *Deutsche Predigten*, p. 36. Cf. the description of the joys of paradise in Otfrid, v, 23, 'De qualitate caelestis regni et inaequalitate terreni.'

319. *Fundgruben*, II, 134, 9 (Apoc. vii, 16): 'non esurient amplius' / daz wirt bedutet sus: / si in hungeret noch gedurstet me, / kein hize duot in we (quoted also by Grau, *l.c.*, p. 130). *Die Warheit*, 123: da ne mach daz wip noch den man / gehungeren noch gedursten / gejameren noch gevriesen. Hesler, *Apok.*, 12680: Daz endorstet noch enhungert / Noch enhitzet noch envrostet. Otfrid, v. 23, 78: thurst inti hungar: thiu ni derrent uns thar. Cf. the Anglo-Saxon *Phoenix*, I, 14, ne mæg þær ren ne snaw, / ne forstes fnæst ne fyres blæst etc. *Gottes Zukunft*, 7508: Ez wirt nit wint noch regen.

338. *Vom Rechte* (Waag, VIII), 544: da ne furchtent si den tot, / da vindent si ewecklich lieht, / da newirret in niht.

354 seq. Hesler, *Apok.*, 15023: Oder du must dort schouwen / Brinnende pech, harz und swebel, / Rouch, lȯn und stinkenden nebel / Und hitze liden und kalt / In aller tuvele gewalt / Mit unlidelicher dole. *Von der Zukunft nach dem Tode* (Kraus, VIII), 10: (wize also manichvalt):...ein fur...einen brunnen also kalt...tal giwurmis vol...swebeles und bechis...eine vinster diche. Heinrich v. Melk, *Erinn.*, 703: ich han fiwer unt finster. *Himmel und Hölle*, 129: egilich vinster. *Die Hochzeit* (Waag, IX), 766: die varent ze der gotes winstir / in eine michil vinster. *Muspilli*, 9: daz leitit sia sar...in fuir enti in finstri. *Mhd. Spiel*, 643: Ir müezent iemer vinster han. Heinzel (Heinrich von Melk, *Erinn.*, Note to 901) quotes the following extract from the *Elucidarium*, 1, 3, c. 4: Secunda poena est intolerabile frigus, de quo dicitur 'si igneus mons immitteretur in glaciem verteretur.' And he adds: 'das soll auf Apoc. viii, 8 gehen: Et secundus angelus tuba cecinit: et tanquam mons igneus missus est in mare.' Cf. also the parallels which he cites. Cf., too, *Sanct Brandan* (edited by Schröder, Erlangen, 1871), line 990 and Note. Schönbach, I, 272, 4: von grozer hitze wider zu grozer kelde, cf. note. Heinrich v. Melk, *Erinn.*, 900: unt der fiwerschober chrache, / unt anderthalb da engegene, / wie sich der helle vrost megene. Further parallels see Note to 901. *Mhd. Spiel*, 905: da sol iu werden heiz und kalt. Hesler, *Apok.*, 21418: Swenne wir an sen die surde / Des grimmen vinsternisses / Und die marter des abisses / Von stinckendem nebele, / Von wallendem swebele, / Dar zu gluende pech gemischet, / Daz nimmer zu ewen vorlischet.... Priebsch, ii, p. 271 1^b, 11: wir muzen hin zv helle varn. mit den vir dampten tuvilichen scharn. die slangen sullen wir ezzen. und sullen croten vrezzen. trachen galle ist unse tranc. des swebels rouch der helle stanc. die wurme sullen unse bette sin. da ist un ruwe eiter win. da ist we und smerzen vil. schrien weinen ane zil. hunger drust vrost und nit. schelden vluchen und strit etc. Ava, p. 313, 269: da ist uiur unde swebel...durst unde hunger...frost...sichtuom...ezzich unde gallen etc. Heinr. v. Melk, *Erinn.*, 718: nu wird ich betwungen / mit durst unt mit hunger. *Millst. Sündenk.*, 208: wan vrost unde hungir.

361. *Von der Zukunft nach dem Tode* (Kraus, VIII), 27: Swebeles und bechis...cf. parallels quoted in notes, and also Heinr. v. Melk, *Erinn.* 728: da sint die swarcen pechwelle / mit den haizzen fiures flammen. 899: die bechwelligen bache; cf. also 929. *Millst. Sündenk.*, 199: da brinnet viures flamme. / mit pech und mit viure / lonet in der tiuvel. Further parallels in the Notes. *Gottes Zukunft*, 7440: Bla swartz fūre uf in stet, / Rot flamme uz in get, / Nebel, gestank und schimel, / Daz ez rucht an den himel. (Not referring directly to hell) *Himmel und Hölle*, 121: beches gerouche, der sterkiste swevelstank (already quoted by Kraus, *l.c.*). *Muspilli*, 21 hella fuir...22 pehhes pina...23 heizzan lauc...26 prinnan in pehhe. *Vorauer Sündenklage* (Waag, XII), 742: wanc bech unde swebel, / diu zwei wallen unde brinnen. *Erlösung*, 6539: si koment in die swefelbach. *Sanct Brandan*, p. 73, 1045: pech, rouch als ein nebel, / darinne gar burndez swebel. Cf., too, 987. *Mhd. Spiel*, 635: da sont ir iemer brinnan; 639: sie (die tiuvel) went iuch sieden alle, / in helschen kezzeln wallen. Otfrid, v, 21, 19: Sie farent, so wir zaltun, in wizi managfultun, / in hellipina noti... / In beches einoti.

363. Heinrich v. Melk, *Erinn.*, 731 : wainen unt wuffen / vil chläglich ruffen. *Millst. Sündenk.*, 184 : da ist wuoft unde we, / ...weinen unde suoftot. *Himmel und Hölle*, 118 karot unde jamer..., 1333 claga wuoft ane trost, 150 aller weskreio meist.

372. *Mhd. Spiel*, 663 : trackengalle sol sin ir win / slangengift ir spise sin. Klee quotes further parallels on p. 39.

375. *Muspilli*, 57 : dar ni mac danne mak andremo helfan vora demo muspille. *Bescheidenheit*, 179, 22 : fürsprechen hant da kleinen strit, / krist selbe da urteil git. Otfrid, v, 19, 47 : Ni mag thar manahoubit helfan hereren wiht, / Kind noh quena in ware, sie sorgent iro thare.

L. A. Willoughby.

Oxford.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

Two Proposed Emendations in Dante's Epistola vi, § 6.

I.

The received reading at the beginning of this section is 'O miserrima Fesulanorum propago, et iterum jam *Punica* barbaries.'

Professor Meyer of Göttingen is one of the leading authorities on the comparatively recent science of 'Cursus,' i.e., the study of the recognised euphonic sequences of the concluding syllables of clauses in Prose Composition, both in Classical Greek and Latin, and also in Medieval Latin. The Classical and Medieval conditions are different, but in each, after their kind, definite rules have with great labour and research been established, especially in reference to terminal clauses. Prof. Meyer has shown how regularly the style of Dante (among others) is controlled by these long unsuspected conditions. He noticed, however, that the termination 'Punica barbaries' does not conform to any recognised type, and he therefore conjectured 'punita barbaries,' which would do so. Practically 'c' and 't' are in many MSS. almost or even quite undistinguishable. In the case of this Epistle there is unfortunately only one MS. extant, which is in the Vatican Library. I have obtained a photograph of this page of the MS., and I am convinced (and in this two eminent authorities on palaeography agree with me) that there can scarcely be a doubt that the word is 'punita,' and not 'punica' in the MS.

Now it is very curious that suspicion as to the reading should have been first aroused by this kind of side issue. But the emendation proposed, besides being confirmed apparently by the MS. itself, seems to be fully justified by other considerations.

(1) No such combination as 'Punica barbaries' is known. 'Punica fides,' and 'Punica crudelitas' are found, but never 'Punica barbaries.'

(2) But if this is not a recognised phrase, it cannot be said that there is any special propriety in associating Carthage in any way with Florence or Fiesole.

(3) The Latinity is intolerable, if 'a repetition of Punic barbarism' is intended. 'Iterum' would require a participle not an adjective. Why not 'altera' (as in l. 50), or 'rediviva' (as l. 104), or 'redintegrata,' etc.?

On the other hand, the application of 'barbaries' to Florence, and to its parent Fiesole, would be thoroughly Dantesque. See *Purg.*, XXIII, 94—96, *Inf.*, XV, 63, 73. Perhaps compare *Par.*, XVI, 49 *seqq.* In *Ep.*, V, 4 the 'coadducta barbaries' of the Lombards relates to their stubborn resistance (as in this case) to the Emperor.

Then as to 'jam punita,' Dante in familiar prophetic manner speaks of the punishment which is already imminent and entirely inevitable, as though it were already accomplished. Compare in this Epistle, ll. 22—25, 73—76, 147—150, and § 4 *passim.*

Finally 'iterum' would be explained in reference to the previous destruction of Florence by Attila (Totila). See *Inf.*, XIII, 149.

II.

The second passage which it is proposed to emend is at the end of this same section, viz., 'ut sine retractatione revertatur.' It occurred to me to test the value of the above argument from 'Cursus' by examining all the terminal clauses throughout the Epistle. I found that one or other of the four commonest forms required by the rules of the Medieval Cursus was found in every single instance with the solitary exception of the passage above quoted. I was content, under such circumstances, to treat this as 'the exception proving the rule'; though it must be confessed that it would be very surprising if this should occur only in the concluding clause of the whole composition. But I was accidentally informed by a friend to my great surprise that the offending word 'revertatur' was not in the MS. at all, and was nothing but an editorial conjecture. The word in the MS. is corrupt and unintelligible, viz., 'riuantur.' The 'n' at any rate is clearly a blunder, since a singular and not a plural is required. It may easily have arisen from an erroneously superposed mark of abbreviation, either (as sometimes) from pure accident, or possibly from confusion with the cross of the 't,' if it had one in the original MS. So that we may safely take 'riuatur' as a first correction.

But curiously enough (as in the previous case), apart from any considerations of 'Cursus,' a little reflection shows 'revertatur' to be entirely out of place here. The context requires a word of exactly opposite meaning. Dante is warning the 'scelestissimi Florentini' that

penitence now, even if it came, would no longer be of any avail. 'It is too late to cry for mercy when it is the time of justice.' Hence to say here that 'the sinner is smitten that he may be converted without falling back' is just to reverse Dante's meaning.

The next thing that suggests itself is that the words appear, both from the manner of their introduction, and from the unusual expression 'sine retractatione,' to be a quotation. If so, it would be natural to suppose the Vulgate to be its source. Now we find in 1 *Sam.* xiv, 39 the expression 'absque retractatione morietur' spoken by Saul in reference to Jonathan. (In E.V. 'he shall surely die,' i.e., without further consideration. In LXX. *θανάτῳ ἀποθανῇ.*) I cannot therefore help thinking that 'moriatur' was the word written by Dante. It would suit the sense exactly; it would conform to the rules of 'Cursus'; it would fulfil the condition of being a quotation, thereby also accounting for the somewhat singular expression 'sine retractatione.' The word 'retractatio' is a *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον* in the Vulgate. And though three references are given in Cicero and Livy by Facciolati for 'sine retractatione,' in all cases the expression refers to an action done by some one 'without hesitation,' or 'with alacrity,' or, as we say, 'without thinking twice about it.' In St Augustine's well-known work 'Retractationes' the word seems to mean 'reconsiderations' rather than 'retractations,' though one naturally leads to the other. That would also suit the sense of the Vulgate and of Dante *h. l.*, but the expression is hardly a natural one, except as part of a quotation.

The chief objection to the suggested conjecture is that there is no process by which a change of 'moriatur' into 'riuatur' could be explained. But in the archetypal MS. the word, or part of it, might have become disfigured through a blot, or a wormhole, or other such defect, or the initial letters may have faded, and thus even a common word might become unintelligible.

Since the above was written, my friend Professor Sayce has suggested to me the ingenious conjecture that 'riuatur' may be a corruption of 'eruatur,' the 'e' being lost in the termination of the previous word 'retractatione.' This has the advantage of explaining in a recognized manner the process of corruption. The argument from probable 'quotation' would lose much of its force, though there might still be a possible 'echo' of the passage in the writer's mind.

E. Moore.

The Precincts,
Canterbury.

Some Cruces in 'Piers Plowman.'

Among the very few passages in *Piers Plowman* which the industry and ingenuity of Prof. Skeat have failed to explain satisfactorily are three that are evidently of set purpose enigmatical. The following attempts at interpretation, even if unsuccessful, may possibly be of service in suggesting the direction in which the solution of the puzzles should be looked for.

In B xiii, 150–1, Patience says:

> Kynde loue coueiteth nouȝte · no catel but speche,
> With half a laumpe lyne in latyne · *ex vi transicionis.*

Professor Skeat confesses himself unable to find any meaning in the last three words, but suggests that 'half a laumpe lyne in latyne' may mean a portion of some Latin text or motto which it was customary to inscribe on lamps in churches. He adds, not exactly as a definite conjecture, but rather as an illustration of the kind of solution which he thinks would satisfy the conditions, that *pax hominibus* would be a 'half line' that would suit the context. It does not appear that the words from the angels' song have any special appropriateness for an inscription on a lamp, and Prof. Skeat adduces no evidence to show that church lamps ever bore mottoes at all. Perhaps a clue to the meaning of the line may be found in the fact that *transitio* was the Latin word for grammatical inflexion. It seems possible that *ex vi transitionis* was a current phrase, parallel with *ex vi termini*, and employed to indicate that a particular interpretation of a proposition is necessitated by the grammatical form (the case, number, tense, or the like) of one of the words contained in it. I have not been able to discover any instance of the occurrence of this phrase, but it might conceivably have been used by some medieval logician when discussing (as Wyclif does in *De Logica*) the effect of a variation of tense in the copula, or that of the presence of a genitive or an ablative absolute in a proposition. Now if my conjecture of the import of the Latin phrase be correct, I think the most natural interpretation of the line is that if the Latin word for a 'lamp-line' (i.e., the cord by which a lamp is suspended) be cut in two, one of the halves will be a word in an inflected form, expressing the meaning which the writer desires to convey. The 'buried word' ought, according to the context, to be a noun, and in the ablative case in order to be governed by the preposition 'with.' I do not know what the medieval Latin for 'lamp line' may have been, but I would suggest, though with great diffidence, that *cordella* may in English monastic Latin have been used

in this specific sense. On this assumption, the word hinted at would be *corde*, which seems suitable enough. Moreover, this supposition would serve to explain the mysterious line that follows:

I bere þere-inne aboute · faste ybounde Do-wel.

For if we substitute *in corde* for 'þere-inne,' we obtain a satisfactory sense, and one that accords with the words in the corresponding portion of the C-text: 'and þow take Pacience and bere hit in þi bosom.'

I must confess that I am not entirely satisfied with this suggestion; but, considering the poet's addiction to feeble and far-fetched conceits, it is only too likely that, even if we had before us his own solution of the riddle, we should not find it very satisfactory. However, I shall be grateful to anyone who will supersede my bad guess by a better one.

In B vi, 328–9 the prognostics that are to herald the disappearance of pestilence and the coming of famine are described in the following enigmatical terms:

Whan ȝe se þe sonne amys · and two monkes hedes,
And a mayde haue þe maistrie · and multiplie bi eighte.

The first line seems to relate to an eclipse of the sun, accompanied by appearances in the sky that were thought to resemble two monks' heads; though it is also possible that the beheading of two monks may be the event referred to. In the second line, it is highly probable that *maistrie* and *multiplie* are used in their alchemical sense. The prodigy announced is therefore that a maid will give proof of the possession of ability to multiply gold. Although the form adopted is that of prophecy, it is not very likely that the marvels spoken of are mere random guesses relating to the future. In all probability the poet is referring to some notorious occurrences which have just taken place, and to which he assigns a prophetic significance. There were several total eclipses of the sun within the limits of time for the composition of these lines (which may or may not be part of the original B-text). There was one on 17 August 1384, which is mentioned by the chroniclers; there were others in 1377 and 1379, which are perhaps more likely dates. One would expect that, in so superstitious an age, such striking events as the reputed possession of the secret of alchemy by a maid, and the appearance of two monks' heads in the sky (or, on the alternative supposition, the beheading of two monks) could hardly fail to be mentioned by some writer. If any notice of them could be discovered in contemporary records, we should have the means of fixing accurately the date of the passage.

In the last revision of the poem this prophecy, which, whether it had been fulfilled or falsified, had ceased to be of living interest, is replaced by another, presumably relating to the time when the revision was made. The words are, as printed by Skeat (C ix, 351–2):

> Þre shupes and a shaft · with an vm. folwyng,
> Shal brynge bane and bataile · on bothe half þe mone.

I think it probable that the Ilchester MS. is right in reading 'viij.' instead of 'vm.' If the 'shaft' stands for the numeral letter *l*, and the 'three ships' for *xxx*, the date indicated will be 1388. I should feel better satisfied with this suggestion if I were able to find a corresponding explanation for the apparently similar passage, B iii, 324–4:

> And er this fortune falle · fynde men shal the worste,
> By syx sonnes and a schippe · and half a shef of arwes.

'Half a shef' presumably means twelve, but the sense of the line is quite obscure to me.

HENRY BRADLEY.

OXFORD.

RICHE'S STORY 'OF PHYLOTUS AND EMILIA.'

It will be remembered that while Hunter found the most likely source of Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night* in the Italian comedy *Gli Ingannati*[1], Collier (with whom most later critics have been in agreement) declared that the 'indisputable source' of the play was the story 'Of Apolonius and Silla' in *Riche his Farewell to Militarie Profession* (1581)[2]. This story, it would appear, was drawn by Barnabe Riche from Belleforest who had it from Bandello, Riche perhaps adding a detail or two, such as the heroine's shipwreck, from a cognate story in Cinthio's *Hecatommithi*; while both Bandello and Cinthio seem to be indebted for their main incidents to *Gli Ingannati*.

It seems not to have been observed that another story in Riche's collection belongs to the same family: viz., the eighth—'Of Philotus and Emilia.' This story appears again in a Scottish play *Philotus* (Edinburgh, 1603 and 1612) which was reprinted for the Bannatyne Club in 1835, and is in stanzas of 8 lines. The relation of Riche's tale to the Scottish

[1] Mr Morton Luce in his edition of *Twelfth Night* ('Arden Shakspeare') holds the same view, while Mr H. H. Furness and Professor Schelling hold it in the modified form that they believe Shakespeare knew the play *Gli Ingannati* in its closely related Latin form *Lælia*. Peacock's translation of *Gli Ingannati* may be consulted in the 'New Variorum' *Twelfth Night*, pp. 341—359.

[2] Edited for the Shakspeare Society in 1846.

comedy is not very easy to determine. The editor of the comedy assumed that it was based on Riche, and adduced the list of corrections introduced into the edition of 1612 as evidence that the author was living. The corrections however are in the direction of anglicisation, and seem very unlikely to have been the work of the original dramatist. And the play is of so rude and childish a type that (without more knowledge of the state of the drama at Edinburgh in 1603) one is inclined to accept the suggestion[1] of Riche's editor of 1846 (Collier?) that Riche's story and the comedy alike go back to some lost common source. However, if that is so, both versions must be extraordinarily close to their original: as beyond the introduction of an extra character in the comedy—the 'Macrell' or bawd—the two stories are practically identical.

Their immediate source, if there was one, is lost, but the ultimate source is, I think, evident. I say so with some diffidence, as it was not detected by Professor Koeppel in his work on the sources of Riche's stories in *Studien zur Geschichte der italienischen Novelle in der englischen Literatur* (1892), pp. 47—50.

New motives have been added, but the skeleton of the story in Riche and in the comedy is the familiar situation of *Gli Ingannati*. Here again we have two old men, Alberto and Phylotus. Alberto has two children, a son Phylerno, whom he had not seen since his childhood, and a daughter Emilia. Phylotus desires Emilia in marriage. To escape him she takes refuge in the dress of a page in the household of a man whom she prefers, Flavius. (In this version of the tale Flavius has procured her her disguise and receives her as his wife.) Her escape from home in boy's dress is reported by a servant to her father, and he and her old suitor Phylotus run out 'like a couple of madde menne' in search of her. They meet Phylerno who has just arrived at Rome from Naples to find his father and mother, and is so like his sister Emilia that they at once take him for her. (We have an exactly corresponding scene in *Gli Ingannati* and *Lælia*—and what follows is the same in both cases.) Emilia's clothes are sent for, and Phylerno is induced to enter Phylotus' house. Here in his character as a girl he is shut up with Phylotus' daughter Brisilla with the result that they take one another for husband and wife. There are fresh motives here. (1) Phylerno pretends to Brisilla a sudden transformation of sex, (2) he goes through a form of marriage with Phylotus, after which he beats him—still in the character of being his wife. But these points seem unessential. Flavius

[1] *Riche his Farewell* (Shaks. Soc., 1846), p. ix.

has been present at the marriage of Phylotus and Phylerno (Flavius here is not a suitor for Brisilla as in *Gli Ingannati*) and having taken Phylerno for Emilia, turns the true Emilia out of his house (not as having been false to him, but as being a spirit). When all parties are brought together Phylerno confesses his union with Brisilla, Flavius receives back his Emilia, and 'bothe the marriages consumat in one day.' So that Phylotus is left, like Gherardo in *Gli Ingannati*, as the only party who is not 'well pleased and contented.'

I should add that my attention was called to the story of Phylotus and Emilia by a paper in *Modern Language Notes*, XXIV, No. 4, kindly sent me by the author, Professor C. R. Baskervill, of the University of Texas, who sees in Riche's tale the source of Shirley's *Love Tricks*.

I thought that if Shakespeare were indeed indebted to Riche's *Apolonius and Silla* for the story he used in *Twelfth Night*, it might turn out that he had taken some hints at any rate from Riche's other version of the *Gli Ingannati* story in *Phylotus and Emilia*. In that expectation I have been disappointed. Like as the latter tale is to *Gli Ingannati*, it is most like it in points in which *Twelfth Night* does not follow it.

I think, however, that Shakespeare did make some use of Riche's collection apart from his use of *Apolonius and Silla*, in which I strongly believe. Mr W. A. Neilson, in the *Atlantic Monthly* for May 1, 1902[1], suggested—I think rightly—that Malvolio's imprisonment in the dark house was partly based on a similar incident in Riche's fifth story—'Of two Brethren and their Wives.' And perhaps we may go further. In Riche's book, p. 154, we read that 'the Doctor tooke sparmaceti, and suche like thynges that bee good for a bruse' which may have suggested Hotspur's speech in *I Hen. IV*, I, 3. 57,

> telling me the sovereign'st thing on earth
> Was parmaceti for an inward bruise.

Again on pp. 138, 139 we read 'what hope is...to be looked for in these kites of Cressides kinde?' When Shakespeare calls Doll Tearsheet 'the lazar kite of Cressid's kind' (*Hen. V*, II, 1. 80) he is generally said to have had in mind Gascoigne's 'Kits of Cressides kinde' in his *Dan Barthlomew of Bathe*. Perhaps we should rather say that he found the phrase in Riche, Riche having borrowed it from Gascoigne, who was his friend, and who died in 1577.

G. C. Moore Smith.

Sheffield.

[1] Luce, ed. *Twelfth Night*, p. 189.

Gray and Muretus.

Mark Pattison, writing on Muretus (*Essays*, vol. I, pp. 124—131, reprinted from *The Times* of Aug. 23, 1882), observed that 'the Tennysonian "starlike sorrows of immortal eyes" (*A Dream of Fair Women*, stanza 23) bears a near affinity to a line in these Juvenilia (XXVIII, *Lusus cum amica*):

> Pande oculos, pande stellatae frontis honorem.'

There is a far closer resemblance, however, between another part of Muretus's Latin poetry and a passage in Gray's *Bard*:

> Cum, velut excelsa residens in puppe, Voluptas
> Arbitrio mentem pellit agitque suo,
> Horrida bacchantes ineunt certamina venti,
> Navemque in Syrtes et vada caeca trahunt.
>
> *Juvenilia*, LXXXIX, *De Voluptate et Ratione*, 1—4.

and

> Fair laughs the Morn, and soft the Zephyr blows,
> While proudly riding o'er the azure realm
> In gallant trim the gilded Vessel goes;
> Youth on the prow, and Pleasure at the helm;
> Regardless of the sweeping Whirlwind's sway,
> That, hush'd in grim repose, expects his evening-prey.
>
> *The Bard*, ll. 71 ff.

With the fourth of Gray's lines Mitford compared Ovid (?), *Heroides*, Ep. XV, 215 sq.

> Ipse gubernabit residens in puppe Cupido:
> Ipse dabit tenera vela legetque manu.

But in several respects the last three lines in Gray have more in common with Muretus, himself indebted to the author of Sappho's epistle. 'Pleasure' is the exact equivalent of 'Voluptas,' and 'the sweeping Whirlwind's sway' recalls 'Horrida...venti.' Further, while the ship of the earlier Latin lines, as may be seen from their context, is a real vessel, that of Muretus and Gray is metaphorical.

Coleridge (*Biog. Literaria*, ch. i) thought that Gray's original was *The Merchant of Venice*, II, vi, 14 sqq. It may be rash to suggest that in the resemblance to Muretus too we have a case of indebtedness, not of mere coincidence. But it seems worth noting that an edition of Marcus Antonius Muretus's *Juvenilia* was published in 1757 (nominally at Leyden, but apparently in Paris), that *The Bard* was printed, together with *The Progress of Poesy*, at Horace Walpole's Strawberry Hill Press in July of the same year (see Walpole's letters quoted on p. 182 of D. C. Tovey's edition of Gray's Poems), and that the six lines

in question were substituted for those originally occupying their place (Tovey, p. 216, and p. 205; Gray to Mason, in a letter written in June: 'the six last lines of the fifth stanza are new; tell me if they will do,' Gosse's edition, vol. II, p. 317).

With regard to the question of Gray's indebtedness elsewhere to any Latin poet of the renaissance, Mr Gosse suggests (I, 137) that the *Amatory Lines*:

With beauty, with pleasure surrounded, to languish,

are 'a paraphrase of an epigram in the sixth book of the *Erotikon* of Hercules Strozius the Elder, *Ad Carolum*.' By this is meant the tenth poem in lib. VI of the *Erotica* of Titus Vespasianus Stroza (Hercules was the *son*). Mr Gosse's index seems at the first blush to indicate a further obligation on Gray's part to a neo-Latin versifier, as we read 'Scaliger, Julius Caesar, *The Propertius* of Gray influenced by the writings of, II, 112.' The words prove to be these (letter to Richard West, May 8, 1742): 'Now, as to myself and my translation, pray do not call names. I never saw Broukhusius in my life. It is Scaliger who attempted to range Propertius in order; who was, and still is, in sad condition.' The reference here is fairly obvious and has nothing to do with Julius Caesar Scaliger. Gray had sent West in the previous month his translation of Propertius, II, 1, and speaks of Joseph Scaliger's contribution to the textual criticism of the poet in his edition of Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius.

EDWARD BENSLY.

ABERYSTWYTH.

THE OMISSION OF 'HAVE' BEFORE A PAST PARTICIPLE.

In the first number of the *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift* (January 1909) Professor Bang of Louvain remarks in his review of Mr Tucker Brooke's *Shakespeare Apocrypha*: 'Schlimm ist's schliesslich, wenn T. B. in der Anmerkung zu *The Puritaine Widdow*, III, 2. 40: "O goodly godly sister, would you had me lost more?" ein Fragezeichen benutzen muss[1], denn der Ausfall von *have* im Inf. Perf. gehört doch zu den bekannteren Tatsachen—wennschon die Grammatiker ihn nicht aufzuführen scheinen. Vergl. nur: "I *would* not *thought* it possible" in Heinrichs Brief zu Anne Bullen in *Harl. Misc.* I, p. 198, no xvi; Nashe (ed. McKerrow), I, p. 271, 26: "thou *shouldst* so vnarteficially and odiously *libeld* against him as thou hast done"; Heywood *Proverbs*

[1] Mr Tucker Brooke's note is: 'had] ? have had.'

(ed. Sharman), p. 37: "and his heire had I bin, had not this chaunced, | Of lands and goods which *should* me much *avaunced*"; *Queen Hester* (ed. Greg, *Materialien*, v), l. 426: "And they that *should assisted*."'

I had intended to draw attention to this little-noted peculiarity of Elizabethan syntax before I saw Professor Bang's note. In my edition of *Club Law* I illustrated l. 115, 'that wee *might* but *had* the villaine to the pumpe,' by Kyd, *Spanish Tragedy*, III, 3. 41: 'Come Sir you *had* been *better kept* your bed.' Since then I have collected the following instances which may be added to those given by Professor Bang: *Coriolanus*, IV, 6. 33, 34: 'We *should* by this...if he had gone forth consul, *found* it so'; *London Prodigal*, IV, 3. 44: 'Flowerdale *had like to peppord* us'; Dekker, *Shoemaker's Holiday*, III, 3: 'I would have sworn the puling girl | *Would* willingly *accepted* Hammon's love'; Phillips, *Patient Grissell* (Malone Society), l. 47: 'he...*had lyke to broke* my nose'; S. Briggs (?) *On a sophister of Caius College* (Rawl. MS. Poet. 147): 'he *might outrode* his witt.'

I was inclined to suggest as the explanation of this phenomenon the sinking of 'have' to 'a'—which then disappeared, just as 'on,' having sunk to 'a,' disappeared before a verbal noun in phrases like 'he went a hunting.' I have since, however, been referred to Prof. Jespersen's *Growth and Structure of English Lang.*, p. 83, where the author remarks: 'The Scotch idiom "He wad na wrang'd the vera Deil" (Burns), "ye wad thought Sir Arthur had a pleasure in it" (Scott), where an Englishman cannot omit *have*, has an exact parallel in Danish "vilde gjort," etc.' This Danish use perhaps militates against my explanation. I gather, however, that Prof. Jespersen looks on the Scotch examples as rather a parallel development to the Scandinavian than as due to special Scandinavian influence; and he seems unaware of the existence of English examples of the idiom.

G. C. Moore Smith.

Sheffield.

Old English 'gefyrhþe' and 'frið' and the Latin Suffix '-ētum.'

O.E. *gefyrhþe* and *frið* in *deorfrið* may be explained as 'a collection of fir trees,' 'forest.' The element is preserved in several Modern English Place Names, e.g., *Chapel-en-le-Frith* in Derbyshire, and Lancashire *Firbank* which appears in Lancs. Inquests (Farrer), p. 258, 1283, as *Frithebancke*, and in 1301, Lancs. Fines (Farrer), Vol. I, p. 215, as *Frithebank*. The Lancs. name *ffrythbroke* 1287, Farrer's Lancs. Pipe Roll, Charter III, Series II, p. 298, of which I have not

found a modern form, probably contains the same word. The point of interest is that *gefyrhþe*, cf. O.E. *furh* 'fir tree,' O.H.G. *foraha*, is clearly from an earlier **furhiþō-*, Idg. **pr̥k^{w}-īta, -īto.* This suffix may certainly be related to the Latin *-ētum* Idg. **-ēitom* in *querc-ētum, pīn-ētum, pom-ētum, arbor-ētum*, etc., which implies a 'collection' of trees. In fact *quercētum* from **perk^{w}ēitom* is almost precisely cognate with O.E. *gefyrhþe*, the only difference being that of the Ablaut of the first syllable. It would be interesting if there were other O.E. tree names with this suffix, though I know of none. Possibly some may exist in Place Names still to be unearthed.

This identity of the Latin and O.E. suffixes has not, so far as I know, been pointed out before.

The above explanation seems to me more convincing than that which identifies *friðˇ* in *deorfriðˇ* (Laud Chron. Ann. 1086, Plummer's Ed. p. 221) with the word meaning 'peace.' It is clear that the passage 'he sætte mycel deor friðˇ' refers to William's afforestation schemes, possibly to the planting of the New Forest. It seems ridiculous to take the word as meaning a 'place where deer are at peace'! Yet that is what Bosworth-Toller and Plummer practically do. Skeat in the *Concise Etym. Dictionary* appears to identify Mod. *frith* with O.E. *friðˇ* 'peace,' but assumes a different origin for M.E. *frith* 'wooded country.' The latter he rightly identifies with *gefyrhðe* in Birch, Ch. III, 120. This is our word, and the form agrees entirely with the views expressed above. Whether the German *einfriedigen* is cognate with O.E. *gefyrhðe* etc. is another matter. Doubtless the belief that this was derived from *friede* in the sense of 'peace' helped to build the mare's nest about the O.E. word.

H. Cecil Wyld.

Liverpool.

An Icelandic Proverb ('Thin End of the Wedge').

In *Hrafns Saga Sveinbjarnarsonar*, printed in *Biskupa Sögur*, I, pp. 639—676, and in the Oxford *Sturlunga Saga*, II, pp. 277—311, the two MSS. seem to give two misreadings of a proverb, which ought to be restored: (A) en fyrir því at 'Lítið er nef var en breiðar fjaðrar' (so in the Oxford edition, p. 282). (B) en fyrir því at lítið er nef vort en breiðar fjaðrar. B (*vort*) is a foolish attempt to correct A; A (*var*), which is nonsense, is nearer the original. Read: Lítið er nef örvar en breiðar fjaðrar; 'little is the arrow's neb and broad the feathers.'

W. P. Ker.

London.

REVIEWS.

Geschichte des Neueren Dramas. Von WILHELM CREIZENACH. IV. Band. Das englische Drama im Zeitalter Shakespeare's. I. Teil. Halle: Max Niemeyer. 1909. 701 pp.

English students have naturally looked forward with special interest to the present instalment of Professor Creizenach's standard History of the Modern Drama. They will not be disappointed; for, while there are some things which they will not find in this portly volume, there is not a page in it which they will wish away. It contains little or nothing of the kind of aesthetic criticism of Shakespeare and his predecessors which, so far as German writers were concerned, began with A. W. Schlegel and his school, and went out with Ulrici and his immediate followers. Its place is taken by what, for want of a better name, we may call *Realpoetik*. The inductive method has prevailed over the deductive; the historian includes the critic, instead of the critic supplanting the historian; and a book towards the production of which have already gone great learning and infinite pains, makes plain its principal purpose—that of showing how one of the most important branches of modern literature grew, and what fruit it bore.

The present section of Professor Creizenach's work, which extends over seven hundred closely printed pages, is arranged in nine books, but falls naturally into three divisions. The first and shortest of these deals with the history of the English theatre during the years from 1570 to 1587—a period which cannot be called barren, but which was still, so far as the popular stage was concerned, essentially tentative. The author has, in earlier portions of his work, treated the beginnings of the English popular drama, both religious and secular, and to these he incidentally returns; for the morality has a long-lived growth, and was not dead in the last decade of the sixteenth century. He has also already dealt with the classicising drama, mainly but not altogether a product of universities and schools, which in Western dramatic literature at large had striven to assert its predominance, but was to prove incapable of maintaining it in two national dramatic literatures of otherwise unequalled productivity and splendour, the English and the Spanish. As for the English drama of the seventeen years or thereabouts which preceded the advent of Marlowe—a date nearly coinciding with that of the great political crisis of the reign—

its history is not devoid of the names of some interesting plays; and this number might be larger, but for the unlucky gap in the Stationers' Register extending over the first five of the years in question. But among the dramatists, while Whetstone (though more ready to compromise than the author of the *Apology for Poetry*) held himself more or less aloof from the popular drama, and Lyly, the foremost dramatist of the period, and the *raffineur de l'anglais* in drama as well as in novel, stands apart, Peele's *Arraignment of Paris* is, as Professor Creizenach puts it, with the exception of Munday's recently discovered *Fedele and Fortunio*, the single play demonstrably produced before 1587 by one of the playwrights who after that date wrote for the popular stage. The plays belonging to this period are accordingly here classified (with the exception of Lyly's) according to subjects rather than according to authors. Among the *Ritterstücke* (a genre more frequent in the early English drama than in the early English novel) Professor Creizenach mentions *Sir Clyomon and Sir Clamydes*; this, he allows, may be of later date, and I am glad to see that he agrees in rejecting Dyce's ascription of it to Peele—a rare error of judgment. May not *Myngo* (p. 20 note) have some connexion with the Spanish *Mingo*—Collier notes a play called *Myngo* performed at Bristol in 1578? In this and other species there was nothing new; but such was not the case with the beginnings of the pastoral drama which in this period was introduced into the performances at court and especially those of the Chapel Children. Professor Creizenach, however, is careful to point out that it would be premature to seek in these early efforts for traces of the influence of the ideal style of Tasso, whose *Aminta*, though performed as early as 1572, was not printed till 1581, or translated into English till 1591. Although Professor Feuillerat's most important monograph on Lyly could not have reached Professor Creizenach, his appreciation of that brilliant writer is thoroughly adequate; nor is the patriotic note in him forgotten: as a matter of fact, the allusion in *Midas* is one of the very few references in the Elizabethan drama to the fate of the Great Armada. As to existence of direct allusions in *Endimion*, though I am not prepared to bind myself to M. Feuillerat's interpretation of them, I think Professor Creizenach ultra-sceptical.

The second division of the present volume, of which it fills considerably more than half, deals with the characteristics of the dramatic literature of the Shakespearean age under a series of heads which may be enumerated in succession. The period under review covers, it will be seen, what may, in a word, be called the great age of the English drama, excluding the more or less tentative beginnings on the one hand, and, on the other, the years of decline, to use no stronger term, which unmistakably preceded the date of the closing of the theatres. The career of Shakespeare as a dramatist very nearly, if not altogether, spans the period under consideration, and the interest of Professor Creizenach's elaborate survey is immensely increased by its constant references to Shakespeare's own works as throwing the most complete as well as the most varied light upon the conditions

and progress of the later Elizabethan and earlier Jacobean drama as a whole. 'We shall see,' our historian says at starting, 'how the "gentle Shakespeare," as his contemporaries called him, accommodated himself as a good comrade to the views and traditions of the fellows of his craft, that his victorious power of language, his overflowing fulness of passion, the sunshine of his humour, his penetrating knowledge of human nature, and the depth of his poetic wisdom, manifested themselves within the customary forms, while many others, especially the contentious Ben Jonson, exhibited far more recalcitrance against being treated as one of a body of colleagues. It is only when we examine his works by themselves that we shall arrive at a complete consciousness of how infinitely Shakespeare overtops all the rest.' In one art—that of borrowing purple patches from the classics and thus proving himself at least, in Nash's phrase, no 'poor latinless author'—Shakespeare, largely, it cannot be doubted, from unconscious disdain, fell far behind many of his fellows. Like others of them, he could not quite escape the Hyrcanian tiger; but Professor Creizenach is doubtless right in concluding that, 'after centuries of search,' the harvest of such borrowings in Shakespeare is singularly small, and chiefly, though not altogether, confined to his early plays.

The first subsection of Professor Creizenach's review is concerned with the profession and position of the popular 'playwrights,' the conditions under which they prepared themselves for the production of their plays and actually produced them, and those under which these plays were printed and obtained a literary reputation for their authors. The relations of the playwrights to the upper classes of society, for which they reserved their regard, while they treated the classes from which most of them sprang with little sympathy or respect (and this quite apart from their inevitable quarrel with Puritanism) were of gradual growth: as our historian observes, no traces of a desire to assimilate the tone and ways of the nobility and gentry, and to figure as 'gentlemen writing for gentlemen,' are noticeable in Greene, Marlowe or Nash, while Ben Jonson's ambitions were those of the scholar and man of letters only. On the other hand, Beaumont and Fletcher 'though they manifestly shared in the life of Bohemia, have already quite the character of cavalier poets';—one of them, however, was of ancient descent, and the other of distinguished clerical parentage. Shakespeare's sentiments on this head Professor Creizenach thinks deducible from his application for the grant of a coat of arms—an endeavour in which his fellow-actors Phillips and Pope were likewise successful; but I do not think the terms *Adelstand* and *Adelstitel* should be used as equivalents of the rank and title of gentleman. Of more importance is the question of the relations of Shakespeare and his fellow-playwrights to the works on which their fame rests. It is well known and quite intelligible that Thomas Heywood, whether or not he was the author, in whole or in part, of not less than 220 plays, should have expressed complete indifference as to their publication; but that at the date of Shakespeare's death nineteen

plays by him out of a canon of thirty-six should have remained unpublished, remains after all an astonishing fact in the literature of the world. Heminge and Condell deserved well of it when they resolved that Ben Jonson's 'works' should not stand alone as a collective volume of plays any longer; but, when all has been said, and every attention has been paid to every item of the last edition of the *Century of Praise*, the contemporary chorus must be allowed to be very inadequate, and was swelled by no continental voice. In a note towards the close of this volume, Professor Creizenach observes that the earliest testimonies to Shakespeare's reputation as a poet are peculiar; consisting as they do of Greene's vituperation (1592)—this of course involves an assumption which need not be discussed here—; of the plagiarism perpetrated by the author of *The Taming of a Shrew*, which Professor Creizenach has no hesitation in regarding as a play 'run' against Shakespeare's, and based upon it (1594); and lastly, of the publication of *Locrine* with the intentionally misleading initials 'W. S.,' which, by the way, Malone thought meant Wentworth Smith. The historian's note, though ingenious, evidently itself stands in need of annotation.

Book III, which deals with the religious, political and social views of the playwrights, will to many readers be the most attractive part of this enquiry; but I may pass over it rapidly, as a judicious survey of what is for the most part well-trodden ground. It is well pointed out that the smallness of the part assignable to religious dogma in determining the conceptions of the world and of life formed by Shakespeare and his fellows, is to be attributed not so much to pressure exercised from without—directly by the State, and indirectly by Puritanism—as to the fact that what may be called the Elizabethan point of view in these matters, which the dramatists in the main shared, was not one capable of dominating their works, in the sense in which those of the Attic and the Spanish dramatists were pervaded by religious suggestion. By way of compensation, they enjoyed a freedom of comment on the movement of the world at large which no royal ordinances and no censorship could materially impair. On the other hand, they had not advanced beyond their age in natural philosophy or in the world of ideas of which its conclusions are the starting-points; Mephistophilis in *Doctor Faustus*, who has to undergo so persistent an examination in astronomy, is to all intents and purposes an orthodox upholder of the Ptolemaic system, and Giordano Bruno's influence upon Shakespeare is a baseless fancy. The extravagances of alchemy, and even here and there of astrology, are ridiculed or scorned; but magic and witchcraft, though under Elizabeth many of their supposed operations are not spared sceptical comment, are even in this earlier period never rejected in principle, and from the accession of James I the fierce blaze of persecuting superstition reflected itself during a whole generation upon the stage. Far happier was the association between the drama and the national patriotism of the great Elizabethan age, which needs no comment here; and I cannot return to the theme of the aristocratic

tendencies of the playwrights, great and small, except to direct attention to the remark that, unlike Thomas Heywood and others, Shakespeare nowhere has a kindly word for the citizens of London, where the best part of his life was spent.

Though Book IV, which deals with the subjects of the plays, is perhaps from the point of view of literary history, the most valuable section of the volume before us, the mass of detail contained in it does not lend itself to excerpts. Professor Creizenach shows how the playwrights, while conscious of the infinitely wide range of themes open to them and resolved to use full liberty of choice in their selection, were guided in that selection mainly by dramatic—or theatrical—considerations. Of course, we do not know enough of their individual lives to know how far personal affinities, if the phrase may be used, influenced them in the choice or treatment of their subjects; the wisely temperate page which is here devoted to a consideration of Shakespeare's themes from this point of view contrasts with a biographical romance such as the brilliant volume of Brandes. Historical and local colour, and still less the 'historic sense' proper—with certain exceptions, such as Ben Jonson's *Sejanus*, which prove the rule—play a very subordinate part in the great age of the English drama; what we call anachronisms hardly existed for the Elizabethan playwrights and theatre-goers, or were obviously made necessary by the innocent simplicity of the stage appliances at hand. Plays treating subjects from the national history, of course, stand in a sense apart; of the titles of these an appendix to this book supplies a very useful list, by the side of which it would be interesting to schedule carefully the known chronicle and other sources, a task which in the case of *Henry VI* and the old plays on which Part II and Part III are founded most editors perform in a very perfunctory fashion. Subjects from Scottish history are, of course, not included in this list; but the *Tragedy of Gowry*, acted in 1604, and duly stopped by authority, is mentioned elsewhere. What would one not give for a discovery of the stage manuscript and an edition of it by Mr Andrew Lang! None of the extant plays on patriotic themes contain any reference to Drake; the 'playe of the weaste enges' (West Indies) repeatedly mentioned by Henslowe in 1601, Professor Creizenach thinks, may have dealt with one of Raleigh's expeditions, which are apparently also treated in other plays of the time. No space is left me for reference to other groups of plays in our historian's survey; he points out how very scant was the list of subjects taken from English works of fiction, with the single exception of the *Arcadia*; and, in a general way, he observes that he can recall no instance in which Shakespeare, in the proper sense of the word, *invented* the plot, main or bye, of any one of his comedies, except the immortal imbroglio of the loves of Benedick and Beatrice.

The interest of Book V is dramaturgical, its subject being the classification and structure of Elizabethan and early Jacobean plays. The supremely distinctive feature of the English drama in this age, the origin of which should not be sought in any conscious innovation,

lies of course in the combination of the tragic and comic elements. To this combination or mixture it was sought to give a name by supposing a distinct species, which actually figured as such on the title-page of the 1616 edition of Ben Jonson's works; but the term *tragicomedy* was not, in fact, consistently applied, and by being in turn made to cover a good deal more and a good deal less than it actually implies, has given rise to not a little critical confusion. Professor Creizenach has some admirable remarks on the structure of plays, as affected both by the combination to which reference has been made and by the conditions of the stage. He is especially interesting on the subject of *polymythia*, or the combination of several actions or plots, a practice essentially unknown to Marlowe, and disused by Shakespeare in his maturest period, though carried out with consummate effect in *King Lear*. As is well known, it became a chief care of the 'best plotters' of the later Stuart drama. Attention may also be directed to the observations on the Elizabethan tendency to lead up to 'situations' for their own sake rather than for that of their place in the general action—not the *scène à faire* which combines both objects and of which we used to hear so much from the late Francisque Sarcey, but rather the gem for which much around it is merely a setting, and which, as Professor Creizenach suggests, is most in place in Lamb's *Specimens*. Equally good is the passage concerning what he calls, by an untranslatable compound, *Stimmungsruhepausen*, often marked, as is appropriate to the lyrical character of such scenes or parts of scenes, by 'soft music' or a song. The illustration which will occur to every reader, though it is here passed by, is, of course, Desdemona's scene with Emilia and the willow song.

Book VI, it cannot be denied, rises to the height of the entire theme of this main division of Professor Creizenach's volume, for it treats of what was the greatest strength of the English drama in this age, and the greatest strength of its greatest writer, the drawing of character. The wealth of characters to be found in the plays of the period—I have not verified the statement that Shakespeare's contain in all twelve hundred—does not exhaust their infinite variety; for there is depth in the remark that the romantic drama, unfettered by the Aristotelian rule paraphrased by Horace—

> servetur ad imum
> Qualis ab incessu processerit, et sibi constet—

is able to show the changes which events effect in man. Typical characters, so important in other national theatres, in English drama play a secondary though of course a very notable part, and one enhanced by the effect, which it is difficult to overestimate, of sheer stage tradition. There follows an excellent account of the significance of the clown in the Elizabethan drama. The influence of the *commedia dell' arte* is not overlooked; but a native origin is vindicated for the figure of the clown, for which Tarlton and Kemp, but the former in particular, secured a theatrical position of extraordinary dominance.

He almost entirely superseded the Vice, of whom, however, traces may still be found in Shakespeare. Familiar as is this subject, together with that of the distinction between clowns and fools, it is treated here with much freshness; and Shakespeare's inexhaustible power of inventing and contrasting representatives of both species is illustrated with genial humour. A subspecies invented by him, and imitated perhaps more frequently than any other Shakespearean type, was the constable, the Londoner's everlasting delight at all times and in all phases of inefficiency.

I have left myself no space in which to do more than touch on the seventh and eighth Books of a volume which, though steadily pursuing the course marked out by the author for himself, abounds in the most varied interest. In Book VII (Prosody and Style) I may direct attention to the argument that in the dropping of rime in his dramatic poetry Shakespeare followed a general change in fashion—a contention which, if maintainable, renders a good deal of comment that has been bestowed on this phase of the development of Shakespearean form superfluous; again, to the remark that dialect is, with a few well-known exceptions, not much used in English drama, especially as compared with Italian; and to the criticism, incontrovertible but not the less worth making, that Shakespeare's prose is invariably clear and good. The use of simile and of other rhetorical figures by the dramatists is discussed and illustrated at length; but of more significance is the conclusion reached at the end of this section that 'tragic gravity' is alien to the Elizabethan and Jacobean drama, from Marlowe to Webster. Book VIII (The Stage and The Art of Acting) is concerned with subjects which, of late especially, have received much detailed treatment from English writers; but even in this portion of Professor Creizenach's work there is not a little that is deserving of attention: I may take as an example the discussion, fuller and more instructive than any I can remember to have seen elsewhere, of the use to which the playwrights put the curtain at the back of the stage and the space behind it, as well as the upper-stage, if it can be so called, on his moderation in the use of which Mayne congratulated Ben Jonson:

> Thou laid'st no sieges to the music-room.

This volume concludes with the first instalment of the continuous history of the English drama from 1587 onward, reaching the year 1593, just before the date when, by a lucky chance, the booksellers and printers flooded the market with a number of manuscripts, of which it is not wonderful that a fair percentage should remain anonymous, while of not a few the authorship is left in doubt. The productivity thus and otherwise attested is of importance, especially as there is hardly a work of this period, not even *Tamburlaine*, which can properly be said to stand alone. While in Marlowe's earlier works, *Tamburlaine*, *Doctor Faustus* and the *Jew of Malta*, Professor Creizenach rightly finds a certain parallelism of theme, he well shows the difference between these and *Edward II*, and, again, *Dido*, which belongs to the

genre of the Chapel Children Plays. Nothing could be more true than that in Marlowe—as in Keats—we recognise a capacity of development which makes the sadness of his premature death doubly sad. The comparison between Marlowe and Kyd seems to me admirable, but I have no space for explaining my doubt as to whether *The First Part of Jeronimo* was really later in date than *The Spanish Tragedy*. Other difficult questions arise in connexion with the authorship of the plays treated in this section; and I must content myself with stating that, in Professor Creizenach's opinion, *Soliman and Perseda* was not written by Kyd, and that *The Battle of Alcazar* may probably be ascribed to Peele. The treatment of the early chronicle histories (among them *Jack Straw*, possibly produced in 1591, in honour of a Fishmonger being elected Lord Mayor) is careful and judicious; and the comparison between *The Troublesome Raigne* and Shakespeare's *King John* singularly fair. At the end of a long notice I cannot enter into a discussion of Professor Creizenach's views concerning the *Henry VI* trilogy, which to many English students will seem extremely conservative. With the early comedies he stands on firmer ground, and, as he observes, nothing could more directly suggest the poet's conscious trust in his own powers, already accompanied by the irony of experience, than the character of Biron in *Love's Labour's Lost*, the earliest of the 'humorous men' who are among the happiest creations of Shakespeare's serenest period.

A. W. Ward.

Cambridge.

Hymenæus, a comedy acted at St John's College, Cambridge. Edited by G. C. Moore Smith. Cambridge: University Press. 1908. xvi + 84 pp.

Fucus Histriomastix, a comedy acted at Queens' College, Cambridge. Edited by G. C. Moore Smith. Cambridge: University Press. 1909. xx + 105 pp.

Professor Moore Smith carries forward his researches on the Cambridge drama and continues to provide students with convenient texts admirably illustrated from contemporary records. While his latest additions have not the interest attaching to *Club Law*, they yet serve as welcome examples of the sort of Latin comedy with which our academic ancestors relieved the tedium of their studies. *Hymenæus*, a play rejoicing in a purely fortuitous title, which is preserved in manuscripts at Lambeth and Oxford, was acted at St John's apparently in March 1578/9. There are, however, obvious inconsistencies in the academic rank ascribed to the different performers, and we are not certain that the editor is right in saying that 'the omission of a degree is a more likely mistake than the attribution of a degree to one not entitled to it.' It might be so if the list were contemporary with the performance; but surely a scribe writing a few years later might very likely add a

subsequent degree to the name of an actor whom he knew to have taken it. *Fucus*, of which there are manuscripts at Caius and St John's, was evidently acted at Queens' about March 1622/3, and in this case the editor, met with the same inconsistencies as before, does not hesitate to assume that the degree of one of the performers is antedated. There are difficulties as to the occasion upon which the play was acted, but the editor's conjectures have been happily confirmed by subsequent investigation (see *Cambridge Review*, 5 May 1910). The two plays are very different in character. *Hymenæus* is a comedy of romantic intrigue (borrowed from Boccaccio) in the conventional classical setting. *Fucus*, on the other hand, while belonging to the same formal category, is of a divergent type. It is, to begin with, an allegory exhibiting the literary and religious feuds that in those days disturbed the peace of Alma Mater. But from the literary point of view this may be neglected, and we are left with two stories of amorous adventure which exhibit very effectively that characteristic of the best Jacobean drama, the double plot.

Elaborate notes record the various readings found in the manuscripts, and help to elucidate the far from classical language of the plays. They also illustrate the indebtedness of the playwrights to the usual authors of academic study, such as Plautus, Terence, Juvenal, Horace, Vergil, Martial, Seneca; but those who best know the plagiaristic and allusive nature of Elizabethan scholarism will least expect to find the list of borrowings complete.

We see that the Queens' College *Lælia* is announced as the next play in the series, and we hope that others will follow.

W. W. Greg.

Cambridge.

The Authorised Version of the English Bible, 1611. Edited by William Aldis Wright. (*Cambridge English Classics.*) 5 vols. Cambridge: University Press. 1909. 8vo. xxiv + 496, 618, 776, 426, 576 pp.

When we call the Authorised Version of the Bible an English Classic, the expression must be accepted with some reserve. It is not possible for us to annex the whole literature of another nation merely by virtue of the facts that we have translated it well, and that it has had a far-reaching influence upon our literature and our national life. To be an English Classic in the full sense of the term, a work must be something more than a translation, however excellent; and in this case the originals contribute not only the whole of the substance, but also many of the qualities of style. Nevertheless the Authorised Version of the Bible, in virtue of its position as a great monument of English, 'a book which if everything else in our language should perish, would alone suffice to shew the whole extent of its beauty and power,' may well be included in a series of English Classics, and the Syndics

of the Cambridge University Press have been fortunate in obtaining the services of Mr Aldis Wright as editor. We have here for the first time a scrupulously accurate reprint of one of the original editions in a conveniently readable form. The Oxford reprint of 1833 is admirably correct, and is printed so as to correspond line for line with the original, but it makes a very cumbrous volume, and it is now priced at three guineas, while the edition in the series of 'Tudor Translations' does not profess to reproduce the original exactly. Here we have the text in five volumes of convenient size, with readable type and on good paper, each page representing one column of the original, so that two opposite pages of the present edition represent a single page of the original folio; and the price is twenty shillings. The first two volumes contain the historical books, the third the poetical and prophetic (Job to Malachi), a rather bulky volume this, but one in which a satisfactory division would be difficult, the fourth the Apocrypha, and the fifth the New Testament. In the first volume we have a reproduction of Boel's copper-plate title-page, which is found in some copies of the original, and in the fifth volume the title of the New Testament is given in combination with the elaborate woodcut design which often serves also for the general title-page, and which is so given in the Oxford reprint. A note with regard to the use of these designs might with advantage have been added.

The text is a reprint of that one of the two editions of 1611 which has the reading 'he went,' in Ruth iii. 15, instead of 'she went.' The present editor, who gives a very useful collation of these two editions, seems to consider that the text which he follows is undoubtedly that which was printed first. The bibliographical question is one which has often been discussed, and the conclusion which is adopted by Mr Aldis Wright has been supported by technical arguments of various kinds; but the collation of the two texts suggests some difficulties, and the opinion of Scrivener upon the subject is not lightly to be set aside. The technical arguments in fact are by no means conclusive, and the comparison of the two texts seems to be on the whole favourable to the opinion that what we have here reproduced is the second issue. It must be remembered in the first place, that though these two editions correspond leaf for leaf, yet they are printed from two distinct settings of type, so that one is not a 'revise' of the other, but a separate impression. This may easily be proved by examination of the word-spacing in any given series of lines. Each edition therefore has its own independent misprints, though the later of the two must of course have been set up from a copy of the former. But in a certain number of passages there are variations of a different kind, and in such cases the 'he' edition almost always gives the more correct text or translation; so that if we suppose that a partial revision took place, it is more likely that its results are represented by this text than by the other. Such passages are Gen. xxxiii. 2, Ex. xxi. 26, Num. xvi. 34, xxxiv. 2, II Chron. xxx. 6, Job xxx. 7, Jer. v. 15, xl. 12, II Esdr. iv. 3, I Macc. x. 47, Matt. xiii. 45, xxii. 24, I Pet. i. 22.

The treatment of the proper names, the forms of which are often more correct in the 'he' edition, suggests a similar conclusion. Moreover, in certain passages where there is variation between the two editions and the reading of the 'he' edition is one which requires more space, there are distinct signs of a crowding of the type. One marked instance of this is in Gen. xlvi. 34, where apparently the insertion of 'an' has caused 'the Egyptians' to be printed without space between the words, to avoid overrunning the line; and the same thing is apparent in a less degree in Micah i. 5 and elsewhere. On the other hand it must be admitted that a few of the variations might seem to support the opposite hypothesis, as for example the margin of Wisd. iii. 14 and Mark vii. 4; and it is difficult to see how the misprint of the 'he' Bible in Exodus xiv. 10 could have escaped notice if the text was set up from a previously printed edition corresponding leaf for leaf.

There are difficulties then in both suppositions, but on the whole it seems probable that after a first edition had been printed, but perhaps not issued, the type was set up for a second, in which the results of a partial revision were embodied, and for which the new and finely designed copper-plate title was used for the first time. The fact that this copper-plate title-page does not occur in any known copy of the 'she' edition tends surely to prove that this edition was printed before the other, for this engraved title is found also in some copies of the later editions of 1613 and 1617, whereas the 'she' edition of 1611 has only the old woodcut design, which had already been used in the Bishops' Bible of 1602. What the occasion of the new setting-up of the type may have been we can only conjecture; possibly some accident, of fire for example, may have rendered it necessary. The circumstance which is urged so strongly by Fry, that the copies of the 'he' edition are for the most part made up entirely of sheets belonging to that edition, whereas most of the copies of the other edition have some admixture of sheets, may be accounted for by the supposition that the issue of the revised edition took place under special superintendence, with a view to securing that the churches at least should be provided with the more correct text, free from such scandalous errors as that of Prov. xvi. 5 ('punished' for 'vnpunished'), or Matt. xxvi. 36, where 'Iudas' had been printed for 'Iesus.' Afterwards the printer may have been free to make use of the sheets of the other edition, which had been printed but not issued, and he made up copies of this edition with tolerably free intermixture of the spare sheets of the other. The ingenious argument of Mr W. E. Smith for the priority of the 'he' edition, based upon the manner in which larger or smaller initial letter blocks are used at the beginning of chapters[1], may perhaps be met by the supposition that in the 'he' edition greater uniformity in the size of initials and in the spacing between chapters was deliberately aimed at, by the substitution in many cases of the smaller for the larger

[1] *The Great 'She' Bible*, by W. E. Smith. Privately printed, 1890.

blocks. The cases in which the larger size occurs in the 'he' edition and smaller in the other are too few to argue from (only twenty in all), and are probably the result of inadvertence. On the whole it may fairly be said that the assumption made in the Cambridge edition is one which requires further justification.

The publication of the Oxford edition of 1833 was occasioned by the complaints made by certain Nonconformists about the unauthorised variations of text which had crept into the modern Bibles. It was intended to shew by an exact reproduction of the original what was the extent of the later variations. The present reprint will enable a larger number of persons than before to make comparison between the original issues and the modern Bibles in the matter of form and language. The difference in orthography and in the use of capitals is obvious, and so are some other points. The modern Bibles omit the preliminary address of the Translators to the Reader, no very great loss, except as shewing how far the individual style of the Translators fell short of that which they attained collectively by the help of their predecessors; they have a much more extended and systematic use of special type (italics now) to indicate differences of idiom between the translation and the original; the marginal notes have been somewhat added to, and the number of references to parallel passages has been enormously increased. But in addition there are many instances of alteration in the form of words, apart from mere spelling. Much the greater number of these are in proper names, and we may here note especially that the original editions have the form 'Hierusalem' almost always in the New Testament, except in the Epistle to the Galatians. With regard to other words, the forms given in the A. V. of 1611 have in many instances been modernised, but usually the more modern forms which have been adopted are used occasionally in the original version. Thus the first editions have 'kinred' as a rule, but 'kindred' occasionally, 'charet' as a rule, but 'chariot' three times in the Psalms and occasionally elsewhere; 'fift,' 'sixt,' 'eight,' almost always for 'fifth,' 'sixth,' 'eighth'; 'fet' usually, but not always, for 'fetched'; 'ought' for 'owed' (e.g. Matt. xviii. 24), 'oweth' for 'owneth' (e.g. Acts xxi. 11), 'rent' usually, but not always, for 'rend' (e.g., 'turne againe and rent you'), and 'renowme,' 'renowmed' usually for 'renown,' 'renowned.' In Leviticus xxv. 5, as is well known, the possessive 'it,' in the phrase 'of it owne accord,' was changed later to the modern 'its'; but on the other hand 'you' occurring occasionally as subject, e.g., Job xviii. 2, Is. lxi. 7, has been altered to the less modern 'ye.' In a good many cases mistakes have been silently corrected, as in Gen. xxxix. 16, Num. vi. 14, Josh. iii. 15, Ezek. xxvi. 14, Mark v. 6, Joh. xi. 3, 1 Cor. xii. 28. In other instances changes have been introduced which are either unnecessary or distinctly for the worse, as 1 Kings xiii. 11 ('his sonne'), Job x. 10 ('cruddled'), xviii. 9 ('grinne': cp. Ps. cxl. 3, cxli. 9), xx. 25 ('glistering'), Wisd. xii. 1 ('uncorruptible'), xv. 13 ('brickle'), Ecclus. vi. 15 ('unvaluable'), Matt. xxvii. 52 ('bodies of Saints'), 1 Cor. iv. 9 ('approved to death'), 1 Tim. ii. 9 ('shamefastnesse'). The corrections which are of value

were made chiefly in the Cambridge editions of 1629 and 1638, and for most of the modernisations we have to thank the editors of the Cambridge edition of 1762 and of the Oxford edition of 1769.

Mr Aldis Wright gives all the credit for accuracy of reproduction in this reprint to the compositors and readers of the Cambridge University Press, and claims as his share of the work only the collation of the two editions and a general superintendence of the printing. We have no doubt that his tribute to the printers and readers is well deserved; but it will be understood without difficulty that the excellence of the result must be partly due to the fact that his accurate and extensive knowledge of the subject, and his sound editorial judgment, were always available when any questions or difficulties arose.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

Montaigne and Shakespeare and other Essays on Cognate Questions. By John M. Robertson. London: Adam and Charles Black. 1909. 8vo. vi + 358 pp.

Beginning with an essay on Walt Whitman in 1884, Mr Robertson has during the last five and twenty years poured forth a ceaseless stream of writing, in which politics and sociology predominate, but religion plays a large part, and philosophy and literature are adequately represented. His lectures on *Modern Humanists* at South Place in 1891 are well worth reading: his *Buckle and his Critics*, 1895, is a work of immense scope, involving acquaintance with much of the most serious thought of our time: since 1899 he has issued four large books on Christianity or Free thought; he has edited Bacon's philosophical works and Shaftesbury's *Characteristics*, and included long essays on these with others on Macchiavelli, Hobbes, Spinoza, De Mandeville, Gibbon and Mary Wolstonecraft in *Pioneer Humanists*, 1907: while pure literature is represented by several volumes of criticism, besides a study of Browning and Tennyson as teachers, 1903, a very meritorious essay on *Titus Andronicus* 1905, and the present book, first issued in 1897 and now enlarged. No one examining even cursorily this great bulk of work, which includes, further, *New Essays towards a Critical Method*, 1897, *An Introduction to English Politics*, 1900, *Courses of Study*, 1904, and *Letters on Reasoning*, 1905, could lightly dismiss Mr Robertson's claims to attention. Much of it may be journalistic in character; nor do we forget that ramifying principle by which a few ideas extend themselves into many subjects. But with full allowance for all this, the industry, ability and flexibility here must be very great. And, so far as we have been able to examine, all is clearly thought and well expressed. Individual style, literary grace and power, are not prominent. But everywhere, like Montaigne, he seizes on substance; and produces the impression of a hard-headed thinker, who knows what he would be at and can find the shortest way to it.

His *Montaigne and Shakespeare* shows thought, hard reasoning, and on special points a tincture of the minute scholarship which modern criticism demands; and yet in a certain sense it may be classed as the work of the politician in literature. Not that politics are obtruded. Rather we seem to note a studied avoidance of them, to which we gladly pay our tribute. The opportunity, perhaps the temptation, is obvious: but he gives no sign of yielding to it, beyond the insertion of a passage in this edition repudiating the Choruses of *Henry V* 'with confidence that they are not Shakespeare's work, having no community of diction and rhythm with his undisputed verse of that date' (p. 218), the doubt expressed whether this play represents the poet's real view of Henry, and the assertion that he 'never again strikes the note of blatant patriotism'—the Queen's stirring speech in *Cymbeline* iii, 1. 16—32, an echo of old Gaunt's, is, we suppose, merely in keeping with her proper depravity. As regards the poet's smile at Utopias, Mr Robertson is quite justified in maintaining that it does not amount to ridicule. Indeed we have always felt that *The Tempest*, even more than its sister-plays or *As You Like It*, is in part a satire on the working of civilization; and that Wordsworth might naturally take Miranda as his model for Nature's 'lady of her own,' as we believe he did. Our judgment is based rather on the general manner and temper of the book, and on what we feel as its inadequate literary sense. The tone is largely polemical; a result, no doubt, of anxiety to defend the position against criticism, but one that weakens rather than improves the general effect, and would do so even were the main contention really a strong one. It is difficult not to feel that the author rather enjoys the combat, and that his subject is hardly of so much moment to him as the discomfiture of opponents. His thesis is that Montaigne was a main ingredient, and a necessary ingredient, in the production of the great tragedies. That surely is his main contention, in spite of an admission that Shakespeare went beyond him in logical consistency, in agnosticism, in pessimism, and in achievement, in spite of an occasional hedging of expression, like '*among* the sources of the greatest expansive movement of the poet's mind, the movement which made him...the great master of the tragedy of the moral intelligence' (p. 176). Montaigne, we read, is 'the deep-striking intelligence that first stirred him to philosophise' (p. 217); his is the culture 'which finally touched him to his most memorable performance' (p. 160): Montaigne 'had determined much of the intellectual colouring of some of the greatest of the tragedies, and had thus given a special atmosphere to Shakespeare's inner life' (p. 289), and 'on reconsideration I am not disposed to recede from any of my expressions which leant more to the notion of "cause" than to that of simple "contribution," seeing that they are qualified by sufficient mention of those forces of experience and primary genius which were equally essential' (p. 284). That is the thesis; and his chief means to establish it is the adducing, with a fine air of judicial impartiality and, we admit, with much scholarly looking before and after, a large number of parallels of

phrase and thought. Intent on making these good, he overlooks the fact that, if all of them were granted, they are inadequate to prove his case. While no one now denies that Shakespeare read Montaigne, and while Mr Robertson may be held to have added to the proofs that he studied him with closeness, still we find ourselves compelled to echo the general opinion that many of the supposed parallels are not really such; and not all Mr Robertson's talk about 'culture-contact' can convince us that Montaigne is at all required as an explanation of Shakespeare's tragedy.

Of the twenty-six parallels cited, only four are claimed as indisputably proving verbal reminiscence: the rest are of idea or idea-chain, assisted sometimes by verbal likeness; and it is clear that their cogency will vary, not only with the considering mind, but with the generality or particularity of the themes they touch. Much questioned as they have been, none of them are here withdrawn; though Mr Robertson's fairness allows him to modify them by citing instances from earlier English work—as in the case of 'discourse of reason,' where they surely annul Mr Robertson's former inference to Montaigne's credit, or in 'thinking makes it so' where we are pleased to see *Euphues* now cited—or from Cicero or St Augustine, as in the Duke's speech on death in *Measure for Measure*; while his confidence in his twenty-second parallel seems weakened by the fact that Professor Churton Collins produced an obviously better one from *All's Well* (pp. 108, 79). Some additional illustrations of the old parallels are added; and a fresh one (xxiv) adduced, which we find as unconvincing as we do his third, fifth, eighth, ninth, thirteenth, nineteenth (save for the suggestion of cold in Purgatory), twentieth, twenty-first, and twenty-third; while 'Conscience doth make cowards of us all' (in xvi) may just as well be attributed like 'guilty creatures sitting at a play' etc. to *A Warning for Faire Women.* Of many, perhaps most, of Mr Robertson's parallels we can only say, 'Non defensoribus istis.'

Descending from these remote, inhospitable and difficult heights, where it might be unscientific to suggest that vinegar has been employed, we reach the *iam humano cultu digniora loca* of chapters vi and vii, much the most interesting and best-written of the book, though the view of Shakespeare's growth—we should have said 'culture-evolution'—is a good deal indebted to Mr Barrett Wendell's study of 1894, to which, indeed, Mr Robertson makes general reference in a note. The eighth chapter disallows the notion of Stedefeld and Feis that *Hamlet* was a sermon against Montaigne, maintains Shakespeare's general deism and agnosticism about a future life, whether suggested by Montaigne or Marlowe, and, after another long discussion whether the striking idea

> Over that art
> Which you say adds to nature, is an art
> That nature makes

is or is not anticipated by various passages in Bacon, closes with a slight comparison of Montaigne's and Shakespeare's social and political

attitude, their retirement from an active career, and their mystic sense of illusion in human life. This is very much to the point: we could wish Mr Robertson had greatly amplified this side of general comparison. Too much space is taken up with mere polemics. The unsuspecting reader who attacks the added essay attractively entitled 'On the Originality of Shakespeare' finds himself entangled once more in the *minutiæ* of argument between Mr Robertson and his critics. And meantime, amid all these parallels and polemics, this straining and hair-splitting, this hard and capable dialectic, we too often feel as if Montaigne and Shakespeare had gone off arm-in-arm, laughing together over folk who 'for a tricksy word Defy the matter,' and wish Mr Robertson could have forgotten his swashing blow, or not noticed that thumbs were bitten at him, but followed them discreetly into the tavern and, seating himself unobtrusively at a near table, listened to and commented on what passed over their cup of sack. For these are the two names in all literature that stand for what is vast, capacious, oceanic, 'too full for sound and foam,' for what is genial as 'the good gigantic smile of the old brown earth,' for the sun that riseth on the evil and on the good, for the ultimate union of Ahriman and Ormuzd in some eternal sphere. Not Homer, nor Plato, nor Dante, still less a dozen lower yet immortal names, have this humane and reconciling largeness in equal measure. But in the manner of Mr Robertson's book we miss the reflection of it; as in its matter we miss much that might have been compared, and more that should have been contrasted, in the two minds—the wider range, the inconstant touch, the indiscipline yet pervading verve, the blossoming wilderness of the one; the fuller grasp and surer hold, the deeper realisation and intensity, the greater art, the 'sudden rose,' the steady soar or failing pinion of the other. We get too little of all this from Mr Robertson; the two are not, for all his parallels, set fairly side by side. *Solvuntur tabulæ?* No. An obligation immeasurably greater remains yet unsatisfied, to evade or disclaim which is to renounce at once the high place a work of this title might assert as its own.

It is useless to complain of the entry into literature of that exact and scientific spirit which is working marvels for us here, as science does in every field. Yet even when the science is really exact, analysis and the massing of details can no more give us a complete account of literature or art than of the sunset, the sea, or those most ancient heavens above us. That Montaigne helped to stimulate and widen Shakespeare's thought, as he does that of all intelligent persons, may be freely admitted. That the recurrence in *Hamlet* or *Measure for Measure* of half-a-dozen or two dozen thoughts found in Montaigne warrants us in pointing to Montaigne as the inspiring or main influence in those or other plays, is a proposition of such infinitely wider scope that we do not understand how it was possible to pass, as Mr Robertson surely does pass, from one to the other. It is this that is in question between him and his critics: the actual parallels, sound or disputable, are an altogether minor matter. It is in vain that he seeks to buttress

his case by explaining parallels in plays before 1603 as later insertions, by underrating the ethical quality of the Histories, by denying Shakespeare's use of North's Plutarch before *Julius Cæsar* (p. 149) and somewhat exaggerating the effect of that 'body of literature' on his mind when he did come across it. Even if we could grant all this, not all this, nor all the parallels collected by Mr Robertson, ourselves or others, can touch the broad fact that Montaigne lacked alike the intense and passionate feeling, and the intense and passionate expression, which alone could make such a claim plausible. To be insensible of that disparity in the furniture, processes and product of the two minds is the gravest disqualification for dealing with either. In Shakespeare passion and feeling were so intimately bound up with fine expression that we doubt if, enjoy Montaigne as he might, he can possibly have yielded him the high respect he certainly deserves. And Montaigne with his philosophic imperturbability, his rational balance maintained through no matter what passing mortifications, his undiminished response to life and power of enjoyment, is quite obviously a stranger to the region in which the tragedies move. He lacks capacity for the whole tragic side of life; and is well aware of it. He knows that souls like Cato, or the martyrs of religion, occupy levels beyond his reach. Admire as he may the heroism of Epaminondas, reverence as he may the grandeur that was Rome, he feels them as mainly an affair of history, excellent as mental *pabulum*, no bad subject for literary regrets, but obviously inapplicable to concrete modern existence, where the grand point is not to let yourself get unbalanced or inconvenienced in any direction. Such a temper, albeit qualified with a certain stoicism for practical ends, is worlds away from the tragic spirit.

Even Mr Robertson must have a sense of this. In his interesting chapter on 'The Potency of Montaigne' the qualities he asserts for him are, not intensity or depth, but range, sincerity, spontaneity, freedom in manner and matter, suggestiveness—precisely the right ones, and those which have been claimed for him by others. Very instructive are the pages (169—174) which show how 'Montaigne has scattered his pollen over all the literature of France'; and, though we cannot quite go along with 'the cadence of his phrases and the beat of words,' he rightly feels that so natural and unstudied a style must have had a healthful influence on Shakespeare's dramatic utterance.

> Such a voice, speaking at Shakespeare's ear in an English nearly as racy and nervous as the incomparable old-new French of the original, was in itself a revelation. And it spoke to one for whom, as player and as playwright, it had come to be an imperative need to substitute a living and lifelike speech for the turgid and unreal rhetoric of the would-be academics who had created the English drama as he found it (p. 165).

But this effect may be traced much earlier than *Hamlet*. It is visible in the *Merchant*, the two parts of *Henry IV*, and the comedies of 1598—1601; and the deepening of thought is visible too. Mr Robertson attributes this mainly to the psychological effect of acting and to acute

personal experience, both of which must have played their part. But something of this oncoming intellectual change is fairly attributable to contact with Montaigne: and Mr Robertson would have made a better book if, instead of minimizing the influence before 1603 and connecting it rather with Shakespeare's tragic side, he could have seen that it is an important factor in the richer note and the advance in 'comic reality' of the period 1593—1600, though continued in later work. Apart from distinct characters of the thoughtful type, 'the censurer of mankind,' long since noted by Hallam in Jaques and Hamlet and the Duke of *Measure for Measure*, and developed, we quite admit, in Lear and Timon, this critical and reflective quality, this pale cast of thought, is already visible in Faulconbridge and Falstaff and Prince Hal, in Arragon's lines over the caskets, in Romeo, in Leonato's remonstrance against those who would

> Fetter strong madness in a silken thread,
> Charm ache with air and agony with words,

in the King's great speech on pride of class in *All's Well*. Ethical quality of this kind first appears with distinctness in *Richard II*, when Marlowe's influence was on the wane; and it will not do to dismiss it as 'largely a matter of saner and more felicitous declamation' (p. 156). Ethical reflection dressed with richness is not excluded from its rank as philosophical poetry by calling it rhetoric; for rhetoric enters into literary art of every kind, and its finest flower is seen perhaps in pregnant simplicities like 'He has no children,' or 'she had Another morn than our's.' Its definite appearance in *Richard II*, and the leaven of it felt from the very first,—inherent in the whole design of *L. L. L.*, as in the conception of Mercutio and the Duke of *The Two Gentlemen*—are proof that Shakespeare did not owe it wholly to the Essayist. This thoughtful smile, this redressing of the balance, this assertion of a large general perception of fairness, good sense and mundane wisdom against particular violations of them, is, indeed, the eternal spirit of Comedy: but it is also the special spirit of Montaigne. And when Shakespeare's soul was more deeply touched and he passed on to the graver comedies and the tragedies, he could still find in Montaigne the ally of this reflective critical analytic spirit, and borrow from him many special thoughts; but the passionate intensity, the bitter outcry, the vision of man writhing in the meshes of his own character or crushed beneath the Juggernaut car of an advancing destiny, this he could no more get from the great Frenchman than he could have got it from Aristophanes or Lucian, from Plautus or Terence. And Mr Robertson's book breaks down precisely because he has not recognized this, but has tried to represent what is almost wholly a comic and critical influence as if it were equivalent to a tragic.

Leaving the main contention as a matter on which he has burnt his ships, and waiving wearisome argument on his parallels, let us mention what seem to us some reflections of idea before 1603. There

seems no sure ground for questioning Shakespeare's ability to read French. If he could not, he certainly could not write the French scenes of *Henry V*, which are neither unlike him, nor inconsistent with the characters of Pistol or Henry. But the first entry of 'The Essais of Michaell Lord of Mountene' in the Stationers' Register dates Oct. 20, 1595, and Shakespeare's personal acquaintance with Florio, Southampton's tutor in Italian, seems all but certain. We find the traces of Montaigne at least as early as 1596. Biron's contrast between the natural gifts and charm of women and the tedious acquisitions of learning may well be suggested by the essay 'Of three Commerces' (iii, 3, p. 418 b, ed. Morley), 'With this learning they (ladies) command without controule, and overrule both Regents and Schooles'; and the same speech reminds us of iii, 5, 431 a, 'Whoever shall go about to remove amorous imaginations from the Muses, shall deprive them of the best entertainement they have, and of the noblest subject of their work.' Shakespeare revised the play for the performance at Court, Dec. 26, 1597. In the *Merchant* are several suggestive passages besides that about the music of the spheres. In the essay 'Of Custome' i, 22, 43 a, just after an allusion to 'the grosse imposture of religions,' occurs 'no fantasie so mad can fall into humane imagination, that meetes not with the example of some publike custome,' the whole passage anticipating Bassanio's reflections on the power of custom and authority to impose the false. In i, 25, 77 b the sentiment, 'That eloquence offereth injurie unto things which altogether drawes us to observe it' is followed by a reflexion on those who 'in common speech... hunt after new phrases and unaccustomed quaint words,' and reminds us of Lorenzo's comment on Launcelot 'for a tricksy word Defying the matter.' In ii, 28, 357 b, 'All things have their season, yea the good and all,' is Portia's 'Nothing is good, I see, without respect,' the general moral of the play and of Montaigne's teaching alike. In Antonio's mouth (i, 1, 78), before Jaques, is found 'the world....A stage where every man must play a part, And mine a sad one'; and if Mr Robertson may be right in tracing it to the *Mirrour* rather than to Montaigne, iii, 10, 518 b, yet in iii, 8, 476 a, 'Unto how many fond and shallow minds hath in my dayes a sullen, cold, and silent countenance served as a title of wisdom and capacity?' we have surely the original of Gratiano's reply—

> There are a sort of men whose visages
> Do cream and mantle like a standing pond,
> And do a wilful stillness entertain,
> With purpose to be dress'd in an opinion
> Of wisdom, gravity, profound conceit, etc.

and the immediately following words of the essay, 'Dignities, charges and places are necessarily given more by fortune then by merit,' probably suggest Arragon's wish,

> O that estates, degrees, and offices
> . . . . . .
> Were purchas'd by the merit of the wearer.

In regard to *Henry V*, the weight of critical opinion regards the quarto of 1600 as an abridgment from the version given later by the Folio, not as a first sketch for it; and we may note not only the soliloquy on kingship, but Fluellen's 'disciplines of the war, the Roman wars' as perhaps due to the title of ii, 34, 'Observations concerning the meanes to warre after the maner of Julius Cæsar,' while Amurath's tyranny finds a mention in iii, 1, 407 a, and the name at least in ii, 29, 361 a. So, too, Hamlet's 'rather beare the euilles we haue, Than flie to others that we know not of' (Q^1) may remember Solon's remark (iii, 9, 490 a), 'there is none that would not rather chuse to carry back with him such evils as he alreadie hath, then come to a lawfull division with other men of that chaos of evils'; and, after 1603, Edgar's doubt 'how conceit may rob the treasury of life' etc., may be suggested by the instances in ii, 25 of a counterfeited becoming a real blindness. And in *The Tempest* Montaigne himself probably stands as general model for Prospero (as Euphues had stood for Jaques), in his bookish pre-occupation, his efforts in self-discipline, his sense of illusion, his 'every third thought his grave,' his concern with the education of the young, even his servant, irreclaimable from 'roguing laziness' and wild habits like 'gathering of muskles in a common sincke for his dinner' (iii, 3, 556 a); and Prospero's recipe of 'a solemn air' as 'the best comforter For an unsettled brain' recalls i, 46, 137 a, where Pythagoras 'by a solemne, grave, severe, and spondiacall kinde of musicke, did sweetly inchaunt, allay, and in-trance' the 'rash, violent, and law-lesse lust' of 'two young men.' Lastly 'your soft cheveril conscience' of *Henry VIII*, ii, 3, 32, a scene which Spedding gave to Shakespeare, corrects Florio's misuse of the phrase in 'so tender or cheverell a conscience' iii, 1, 407 a. These, nearly all noted (though not inserted) while composing a study on Montaigne five years since, seem closer than most of Mr Robertson's, though he may not agree. We believe their number could be largely increased, and that no increase would give Montaigne any nearer interest in Shakespeare's tragic achievement.

To the much-discussed question of Shakespeare's learning, besides the rather jejune chap. iv which simply examines the Seneca parallels of Dr Cunliffe, and the brief chap. v about Bruno, Mr Robertson devotes a new Introduction contesting with some success the arguments of Churton Collins, another passage (pp. 93—103) inserted to disprove his allegation of a parallel from *Alcibiades Primus*, and a separate essay at the close. We are no believers in the idea of Shakespeare's study of Greek authors in Latin translations, though we think it would be possible in a chance case; and Mr Robertson justly complains of talk about Greek idioms in the work of one supposed to reach Greek writers by that channel. Undoubtedly Collins pushed his thesis too far; but he fell back at the close of his essay on 'probability,' and the intelligent reader surmises that the thesis with its inconsistent phraseology, which gives Mr Robertson his chance, was mainly a literary garb, an excuse for unloading a number of real parallels from Greek authors, observable only by a wide scholar of extraordinary

memory and alertness, and admirably illustrating 'what Sainte-Beuve calls the Literary Tradition.' When Collins tells us that 'fat paunches have lean pates' (*L. L. L.*, i, 1) is undoubtedly from the anonymous Greek proverb παχεῖα γαστὴρ λεπτὸν οὐ τίκτει νόον, one feels he is speaking truth, through whatever *media* it filtered down to Shakespeare. Mr Robertson seems to us more inconsistent than he, in denying classical knowledge while admitting possible school reminiscence. Knowledge of the classics is classical knowledge, even though acquired at school. The reading of early days affects imagination most strongly at the time, and leaves the most indelible mark on the *tabula rasa* of the brain. Given, too, the initial knowledge of good material in a particular author, the poet might naturally seek more at the same source. We are strongly of opinion that this actually happened to him in regard to Plautus, though the demonstration cannot be attempted here. His ignorance of Greek, his general lack of scholarship, his grievous slips, may be admitted; but not that he was without the motive or the power to learn. And to add to these slips by making him speak of the Lupercal as a hill (p. 337) seems to us hardly fair. 'On the Lupercal' iii, 2, 100 certainly does not warrant it; and the poet must have seen 'the feast of Lupercal' (i, 1, 72), even if we were to admit that scene as the work of an earlier dramatist.

An even stronger presumption exists of his possession of some Italian, the easiest and at that time the most fashionable of modern languages, which Gascoigne says he 'learned in London' apparently before 1566, and to learn something of which Shakespeare had special social inducement, as well as the prospect of dramatic material to be gleaned. We believe we have clearer evidence than any yet produced that he did acquire some power of reading it, though this too must be dealt with elsewhere. The opponents of Shakespeare's knowledge are driven, like the Baconians, to assumptions larger than the admission they seek to avoid. 'Any one,' says Mr Robertson (p. 338), 'who could read Italian, might have furnished Shakespeare or his partners with a translation of the story' of *Othello*. Even if we granted that players or their playwrights might commission translations of pieces or tales they knew nothing about, or give a general commission for the translation of *novelle* for trial—a rather large hypothesis—is it not far more probable, in the then state of dramatic art, that one who could discern dramatic possibilities in a story would himself dramatise it, rather than act as mere jackal to a man of less cultivation? And surely it is easier to credit Shakespeare with some effort in the field of foreign and famous work, than to suppose him to have at his fingers' ends all manner of barren joyless stuff, out-of-the-way treatises, translations of Latin philosophy, woodenest verse, which the press had happened to vent in English during half a century before.

We have something of the same feeling about the suggestion of intermediate plays, and the ascription to other hands of a large share in work that has passed as the product of Shakespeare's first decade. Without accepting Mr Courthope's sweeping restoration to him of

plays that have been doubted or segregated by the critics of a century and a half, we incline to think that the collaborator and the lost play and its later Shakespearean revision are becoming a little too convenient as working hypotheses, and depend largely on an unreasonable scepticism about his powers and attainments. Mr Fleay maintained (*Life*, p. 12) that all Shakespeare's work before 1594 was 'refashioned at a later time': Mr Robertson (p. 78) says 'Unquestionably most of the earlier plays were revised by Shakespeare after 1600,' and talks freely of the survival of alien matter in *Romeo and Juliet*, the *Errors*, *Two Gentlemen* and *L. L. L.* (pp. 5, 143, 238, 260). But Shakespeare's time after 1598 is so well filled with fresh and more powerful work that extensive revision then is as hard to believe in as the production of sixteen or seventeen plays before that date: and, though a marked difference of style must carry weight, we should not feel mere want of taste and art, mere slipshod or mechanical execution, sufficient ground for rejecting a passage, especially in early work, where his hurry was probably greater and his ease less.

There are other points we would have touched on, were not this review already of inordinate length. Let us close it with a word in recognition of Mr Robertson's effort to approach the poet with freshness, and of his at least partial sense of the care required; of his comparison of passages from Marston, Kyd, Greene or Peele; of his clear assertion that Shakespeare, not Marlowe, was the true creator of blank verse by his complete and conscious grasp at length of the principle of 'sense variously drawn out'; of his useful emphasis laid on the actual quotation by Montaigne of many Latin passages which Shakespeare might otherwise seem to have read in the originals. We are not of Mr Robertson's disruptive school, and we think his main thesis sadly needs readjustment; but we are glad to have seen his book, and have striven to give it the attention which its own effort at logic and fairness deserves.

R. Warwick Bond.

London.

Spenser's Faerie Queene. Edited by J. C. Smith. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909. 8vo. xxiv + 518, vi + 519 pp.

A satisfactory critical edition of the *Faerie Queene* has long been a *desideratum*, and this bids fair to supply the need. It forms the second and third volumes of a complete Oxford edition of Spenser's Poetical Works, the first volume of which is yet to come. The book is an admirable specimen of typography, beautiful to look at and pleasant to read, and the editorial work seems to be carefully and competently done. The text is founded upon a fresh collation of the Quartos of 1590 and 1596 and the Folio of 1609, the only editions which seem to have a claim to original authority, and the relation between these editions is very clearly set forth in the Introduction. Mr Smith's object is to present a true text, and not a reprint of any particular edition;

but his work is rightly based upon the edition of 1596 (except as regards the fragment of Book VII, which appeared first in 1609), and the readings of 1596, if not adopted in the text, are recorded fully in the notes, 'so that text and notes together amount, in effect, to a complete reprint of 1596.' As regards the other two editions he records all verbal differences, and all differences of punctuation which are significant, but mere variations of spelling are noted only when they seem to be of interest. Mr Smith is certainly justified in taking the text of 1596 as the basis for Books I—III as well as IV—VI, notwithstanding the fact that the first three Books in the edition of 1596 were printed from the text of 1590, and that the corrections of that text which had been made in its list of errata (or 'Faults Escaped in the Print') are almost entirely ignored. Marked instances of error running through all the early editions in this way are to be found in I, i, 21, ii, 17, iv, 32, x, 59, xi, 6; II, i, 33, ii, 37, ix, 41; III, i, 30, iii, 43, 50. Evidently the author trusted to the printers to insert the corrections which they already had in their hands, and did not in 1596 read through the proofs of the first volume with any close attention; but nevertheless the text of 1596 shows unmistakable signs of his revision. Apart from the larger alterations, the refashioning of the conclusion of Book III, and the addition of a stanza at I, xi, 3, we find numerous smaller changes which are certainly due to the author: as I, i, 2, 'But' for 'And,' with very fine effect; I, vii, 37, 'trample' for 'amble,' a more appropriate word; II, iv, 17, altered apparently to avoid the word 'ketch'; II, v, 19; 'do' for 'garre,' to avoid a dialectical peculiarity which does not elsewhere occur in the *Faerie Queene*; II, vi, 3, where 'as merry as pope Ione' is excluded as too colloquial; III, iii, 53, altered to avoid an awkward parenthesis; III, iv, 39, where a more pathetic effect is obtained by the substitution of 'sith we no more shall meet' for 'till we again may meet'; III, iv, 59, changed for the sake of the rhythm; III, vii, 48, where the reference to Chaucer's Sir Thopas is omitted, no doubt because of its suggestion of burlesque, and not for the reason suggested by Mr Smith, which in fact is no reason. The edition of 1596, then, in spite of its errors, must be regarded as having the author's authority in some degree throughout, and not merely as regards the portion of the poem which was then printed for the first time; but clearly it is to be corrected by the important help of the errata of 1590. The editor discusses also the question how far the edition of 1609 can be regarded as authoritative, and to a limited extent he admits its claim. A presumption in favour of it is created by the fact that this edition contributes two hitherto unpublished Cantos; and as Mr Smith points out, there are some alterations in the text generally which seem to indicate that the editor had original sources of information. Thus a missing line is supplied at I, x, 20, and at III, vi, 45 a broken line is added to an eight-line stanza, 'a touch beyond an editor,' as Mr Smith remarks. In some other places, too, corrections are made which seem to proceed from the author: Mr Smith cites several, and others are to be found at I, xi, 41, III, i, 41 and 60, III, vi, 25, IV, vii, 25: possibly too the rather determined attempt to distinguish the uses of 'sith'

and 'since,' which we find in this edition, may be made on the author's authority. For the most part, however, the variations of 1609 (often consisting merely of slight modernisations of the spelling) are to be attributed to an editor; and it is particularly to be observed that he worked from the 1596 edition only, and did not refer for the solution of any difficulty to the 1590 text of the first three Books. Thus when the metre of a line in this part of the poem has been affected by a misprint of 1596, instead of turning to the text of 1590, as the least enlightened of modern editors would surely do, he emends by conjecture: e.g., I, ii, 29, where the edition of 1590 gives

For the coole shade him thither hastly got:

and that of 1596 by a mistake omits 'him,' the edition of 1609 reads

For the coole shadow thither hast'ly got:

and so in several other instances, e.g., II, x, 51 and III, ix, 13.

Mr Smith rightly enough considers it to be his duty to correct the errors of the printer, but not those of the author. As a rule he shows very sound critical judgment, but there are a few passages in which he has preserved the reading of the old editions when it is practically certain that the author wrote something different: e.g., I, viii, 44, l. 4, where 'delight' is certainly a printer's error, though we cannot be quite certain of the word intended; IV, vii, 22, where the correction 'For' for 'Nor' seems practically certain, and the mistake must have been due to the printers; V, iv, 37, where Church's restoration of the rhyme may safely be adopted ('newe' for 'neare'). In some cases the editor has perhaps too readily assumed that there is error, where there is none. In II, xii, 23, l. 9,

Mighty Monoceros with immeasured tayles,

he has admitted into the text the conjecture 'Monoceroses,' a form which Spenser would hardly have tolerated; and he has not noted that with this reading another change in the line is necessary; we must read 'immeasurd' (as in II, x, 8) for 'immeasured,' for there is nothing in which Spenser is more careful and consistent than in this distinction. Probably he used 'Monoceros' here as a plural, and 'immeasured' is to be read with the accent thrown upon the third syllable. Mr Smith objects that this pronunciation is without example; but why is it more difficult than 'captíued' II, v, 16, as compared with 'cáptiu'd' II, v, 27? Again, the editor adopts the 1609 alteration of 'singulfes' to 'singultes,' but admits that 'singulfes' (or 'singulfs') occurs in three other passages of Spenser, *Colin Clout*, 168, *Teares of the Muses*, 232, and *Faerie Queene*, V, vi, 13, so that four independent printers' errors would be required to account for it. Surely it is more reasonable to accept it as a Spenserian word, more euphonious and more expressive than 'singultes.'

Among mistakes which are due to the author Mr Smith reckons one curious form of failure in rhyme of which perhaps he is the first to

give a systematic account, that is to say, where in place of a rather obvious word which would satisfy the rhyme, we find a synonym which does not rhyme at all, as for example in II, viii, 29,

> Indeed (then said the Prince) the euill donne
> Dyes not, when breath the bodie first doth leaue,
> But from the grandsyre to the Nephewes sonne,
> And all his seed the curse doth often cleaue,
> Till vengeance vtterly the guilt bereaue:
> So streightly God doth iudge. But gentle knight,
> That doth against the dead his hand vpreare,
> His honour staines with rancour and despight,
> And great disparagment makes to his former might.

(The word asked for by the rhyme is evidently 'vpheaue' instead of 'vpreare.') The editor points out that this phenomenon occurs no less than nine times in the *Faerie Queene* of 1596, and in only one of these instances was the text altered in 1609. He comes to the conclusion, after a careful examination of the conditions, that in every case it is accidental, two words rising simultaneously to the poet's mind, and the one which he meant to reject slipping nevertheless from his pen. It may be so, though it is a little difficult to believe that such an accident occurred and escaped notice so often; but I may point out that it is not without parallel. One good example occurs in Meredith's *Last Poems*:

> A wilding little stubble flower,
> The sickle scorned which cut for corn,
> Such was our hope in that dark hour,
> When nought save uses held the street;

with regard to which it is remarked by a reviewer (in the *Cambridge Review*) that for 'corn' we should obviously read 'wheat.' The alternative in Spenser's case is to suppose that after the stanza had been finished in the regular form, the author deliberately altered one rhyme word for the sake of variety; and this is hardly likely. It may be noted that in five of the nine instances the failure occurs in the first place of the rhyme series, where the need for variation would be least felt, and where no effect of unexpectedness could be produced on the reader's mind.

The editor is perhaps too ready to assume confusion of thought in his author, when there is no necessity for such an explanation. He issues a challenge with regard to three passages in particular, which seem to him incapable of explanation or correction. The first is II, v, 12,

> With that he cryde, Mercy, do me not dye,
> Ne deeme thy force by fortunes doome vniust,
> That hath (maugre her spight) thus low me laid in dust.

The last two lines have not been properly explained as yet, but they are not, I think, inexplicable. The meaning probably is, 'And do not estimate thy force in accordance with the unjust decision of Fortune, which has thus laid me low (a curse upon her spite!)': that is, 'Let

not this victory, which is determined only by Fortune, lead thee to boast unduly of thy force.' The use of 'deeme' and 'doome' in evident connexion seems to me to be in favour of this explanation. No doubt the sense here attached to 'maugre' is unusual; and it is not paralleled by 'maulgre them' in III, iv, 39, which is quoted under the same heading by the Oxford Dictionary, for there the phrase seems to have its usual meaning, with a reference to the etymological sense of 'farewell': but in III, v, 7 'maulgre' appears to be used as an imprecation, and the original meaning of the word, 'ill-will,' 'displeasure,' as in *Piers Plowman* B vi, 242, 'He had maugre of his maistre for euermore after,' might easily lend itself to such a use as we seem to have here.

The second passage cited as inexplicable is V, vi, 5,

> And then, her griefe with error to beguyle,
> She fayn'd to count the time againe anew,
> As if before she had not counted trew.
> For houres but dayes; for weekes, that passed were,
> She told but moneths, to make them seem more few:
> Yet when she reckned them, still drawing neare,
> Each hour did seeme a moneth, and euery moneth a yeare.

Here there is no real difficulty. To make the time that had elapsed seem shorter, she reckoned in days rather than in hours, and in months rather than in weeks, so that the numbers at least might be small, and she might hope to forget the actual length of the periods numbered. But the opposite result followed: her mind refusing to be beguiled fixed itself even more upon the length of the portions of which each amount was composed, exaggerating this in imagination, so that hours seemed as long as months, and months as years. There is subtlety here, no doubt, but no real obscurity. An arithmetician indeed might object that if an hour seemed equal to a month, a month ought to seem equal to sixty years, but the fact that the poet does not work the matter out to this logical result is no proof of mental confusion.

The third passage, V, vi, 26,

> Ne lesse did *Talus* suffer sleepe to seaze
> His eye-lids sad, but watcht continually,

involves no doubt a mistake, but one which might easily occur without mental confusion. The sentence was begun with the idea of saying 'Ne lesse did Talus watch continually,' or something to that effect, and then the form of the expression was changed, and the author neglected to substitute 'more' for 'lesse.'

But whatever differences of opinion may arise upon details, the editor's work is on the whole greatly to be commended. He proceeds upon sound principles, and usually displays excellent judgment. It may be added that the Critical Appendix at the end of the second volume presents a more convenient *conspectus* of the textual problems of the *Faerie Queene* than will easily be found elsewhere.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

A Concordance to the English Poems of Thomas Gray. Edited by Albert S. Cook. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co. 1908. xii + 160 pp.

This book is the first-fruits of a Concordance Society which was organised at Yale University in 1906. The choice of an author for the first experiment was influenced partly by the desire to select one whose works lay in a brief compass, 'so that the compilation might be effected by few hands in a brief time, and the subvention required by the publishers might not unduly tax the slender resources of the Society.' The choice of Gray is for other reasons too a happy one: his use of words is a particularly interesting subject for study, and often throws light upon the literary influences by which he was affected. The basis of the concordance is Gosse's edition of Gray, 1884, distinction being carefully made of the doubtful poems, and variant readings being quoted also from the early editions and from the manuscript copies.

The fulness and accuracy of the references seems to be all that can be desired, but we are inclined to differ from the editor on some minor matters of treatment. Gray's spelling of course is kept in the quotations, but the head-words are in some cases unnecessarily normalised. Gray gives us sometimes 'horrour,' but more frequently 'horror' (or 'horrors'), and the same is true of 'warrior' and 'warriour,' while he writes 'rumor' and not 'rumour' in the one place where the word occurs. This justifies the editor in giving the forms 'horror,' 'warrior' 'rumor' as the head-words in these cases, but surely he is not therefore compelled to choose the forms 'ardor,' 'armor,' 'color,' 'flavor,' 'honor,' 'labor,' 'rigor,' 'vigor,' and so on, when Gray never spelt any of these words in that manner. Or again, why should he employ 'rime' as the head-word, when Gray always spelt the word either 'rhime' or 'rhyme'? Cross-references are given, so that no mistake need be made, but the regard for consistency seems here to be carried too far. Again it would have been better, as the editor seems partly to admit, to carry the distinction of homonyms rather further. A distinction is made between 'art' *subst.* and 'art' *verb*, and between 'save' *verb* and 'save' *prep.*, but 'flies' *verb* and 'flies' *subst.* are placed under one head-word ('happiness too swiftly flies,' with 'Judgment from the Harvest flies') and still worse 'rear' *subst.* is grouped with 'rear' *verb*, where there is not even an etymological connexion. But this fault, which would be more serious in the case of an author of greater extent, may perhaps be corrected in the future publications of the Concordance Society.

The work which this Society proposes to itself is a most useful one: a concordance is an almost indispensable aid to the study of a poet's style, and the preparation of one is a piece of work which can very successfully be performed in collaboration. The editor, it is true, speaks of the difficulty of securing uniformity of method under this condition; but with sufficiently careful instructions to the workers, and a reasonable amount of editorial supervision, this difficulty ought not to be a very formidable one.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

English Literature in the Nineteenth Century. By LAURIE MAGNUS. London: Andrew Melrose. 1909. 8vo. 418 pp.

Critics of literature belong to one of two classes; in Mr Magnus's words, either they are 'commentators, not creators,' or they affect 'for art what art itself affects for nature, a new medium of interpretation.' To the latter class of creative critics belong such teachers as Coleridge and Hegel, men whose words have come as a revelation, who have given their hearers a vision not only of the thought of this poet or of that, but of life itself, who have laid down laws of general application and universal interest. Such men share to no small extent the poetic gift of those whose work they are analysing, they rank with the prophets and see, when the eyes of common men are holden. Mr Magnus lays no claim to a place among these seers of criticism; his object is to provide a sketch map of nineteenth century literature, a guide which the beginner will find of real assistance, which will point out the principal landmarks and show the great highways, and in this he has succeeded admirably. He has dealt clearly and succinctly with a difficult and complex period, and his book will prove extremely helpful to those who wish for some introduction to nineteenth century prose and poetry. Its criticisms are not profound, and it has an occasional flippancy of style which jars—to speak of Leigh Hunt as the 'cock of the Cockneys,' or to refer to De Quincey's less happy witticisms as 'stuffed Lamb' is to descend to the level of the comic paper—but it does not profess to appeal to scholars, it aims at initiating readers into the methods of the great authors of the last century. Mr Magnus remarks with some naivety that he has criticised no book which he has not read, and this possibly accounts for the somewhat cursory treatment of certain authors. He is not attempting, as he says, to write a history of literature, and he has therefore a perfect right to omit any works which do not illustrate the particular points which he wishes to make; but it seems hardly worth while to mention Peacock at all, if he is to be dismissed in half a page, with no reference to *Nightmare Abbey*, or *Gryll Grange*, or *Maid Marian*; and we fail to see what light is thrown upon Rogers's place in literature by the unadorned statement 'that he was a banker by trade, and a kindly host in middle life to younger men.' There are too many strings of names; the section devoted to 'the Higher Journalism' consists of little else. But it is an ungrateful task to dwell upon the blemishes in a book which has so much to recommend it. Mr Magnus has the teacher's gift of making a complex subject clear without making it dull. His comparison of Ainsworth with Scott sums up tersely and vigorously the essential difference between them as historical novelists: Ainsworth's are 'novels with a historical background, not history reincarnated in romance.' His treatment of Charles Lamb is sympathetic and appreciative, and a single sentence suggests the strength and weakness of Macaulay: 'He had a genius for generalisation, for bird's-eye views of tracts of territory, and sometimes employed this faculty to prove conclusions not supported by the ordnance survey.' The

author's analysis of the verse of Tennyson and Swinburne draws attention to an interesting subject, though unfortunately he cannot stay to work it out fully. The book is furnished with excellent chronological tables showing what authors were contemporaries, and also what great movements in scientific and religious thought were taking place.

G. E. Hadow.

Cirencester.

The Historical Study of the Mother Tongue. By H. C. Wyld. London: Murray. 1906. 8vo. ix + 412 pp.

The Growth of English. By H. C. Wyld. London: Murray. 1907. 8vo. viii + 199 pp.

The first of these works, *The Historical Study of the Mother Tongue*, is certainly one of the most important contributions of recent years to the study of English. In fact it represents what is probably the clearest and most practical introduction to the higher reaches of the subject that has yet been written, and it should do much in the way of setting the study on a more intelligent basis. Within the last thirty years or so the scientific study of English has made rapid and sound progress—at least in the hands of the pioneers. The importance of the bearing of phonetics on the formal side of language, and of psychology on the logical side, has received increasing attention, while a vast number of invaluable facts has been collected from old texts, decaying dialects and the spoken language of to-day. Yet in spite of all this positive advance, it has to be confessed that the subject remains far from satisfactory, from the point of view of academic study; and as for the plain man, it strikes him either as an awful mystery to which the Germans somehow have the key, or else as a collection of dogmatic statements which he as an Englishman is bound to accept. If any one cause more than another may be adduced for this state of things, it is that the methods pursued by investigators and the general principles underlying those methods, have not hitherto been clearly set out. In concerning itself primarily with masses of unrelated, and often unexplained, facts, and neglecting that training in systematic method without which those facts are more or less futile, the study of English has thus been robbed not only of much of its interest, but, what is more important, of much of its educational value.

It is therefore because Professor Wyld seeks to remedy this state of affairs by deliberately concentrating upon philological method as applied to English study, that his work seems to be of such outstanding value and promises to be so extremely useful to teacher and student alike. The methods and principles presented, are those which have been evolved by earlier workers, both English and German; and the bringing together of this mass of information, otherwise not easily accessible nor

always clearly set forth, would in itself have been a work of great usefulness. But in addition to wide scholarship, Professor Wyld has brought to bear upon the task his experience as a University teacher. The way in which he anticipates difficulties and emphasises essential features, is characteristic of this, as is also the critical guidance given in reference to first-hand authorities, a feature which will be particularly welcome to the more serious students.

The first part of the work is given up to the discussion of general linguistic principles: the second part deals with the main problems of the Indo-Germanic, Germanic, and English languages. The aims of historical linguistic study are first outlined, fundamental points of method and principle being emphatically stated, e.g., 'Nothing occurs in language without a reason.' 'Linguistic study deals ultimately with the spoken sound not with its symbols.' Then after a lucid treatment of phonetics as a working basis, Professor Wyld proceeds to lay down the principles of sound-change, its nature and causes, and also to explain the differentiation of language as seen in the formation of dialects. A concise treatment of analogy, operative in all periods of linguistic development, is followed by an illuminating chapter on methods of comparison and reconstruction in connection with the Indo-European languages, and it will probably be found that this chapter, together with the succeeding one which deals more fully with the Aryan mother tongue, will be amongst those most highly appreciated. It is just at this point that guidance is most needed by students who are apt to be puzzled by the various theories set out from one quarter and another: and in these chapters the necessary help is given. The works of Johann Schmidt, Leskien and Brugmann are drawn upon, and a clear exposition of the phenomena of *Ablaut* is given.

The subsequent chapters which treat of Germanic, Old English and Middle English are marked with the same clear and original treatment as the earlier ones. They form a *résumé* of modern work in this field, and might well be recommended as an introduction to the reading of more detailed work, such as that of Sievers and Morsbach. Here as elsewhere the principles of modern philological method are brought forward and emphasised. Equally suggestive and useful is the discussion on present-day English with which the work concludes. But in this section some reference might perhaps have been made to the line of development taken by the language after the sixteenth century, even though the primary aim is not that of furnishing a history of the language. During the last three centuries the language has undergone certain subtle changes and some general guidance with regard to this rather neglected portion of the history would have been particularly welcome. An account of the earlier borrowings has not been excluded from the scheme.

In general, however, this work of Professor Wyld must be described as a most successful effort to organise a subject of peculiar difficulty. Apart from its valuable matter and its scientific treatment, the book will commend itself to all by its clear exposition, its lucid style and its

close touch with the actual needs of the student. It is certain to be appreciated by teacher and student alike.

The Growth of English is, as its second title implies, a work of a more elementary character, obviously inspired however with the ideas of the preceding one. It is intended for beginners, being written primarily with the needs of Secondary Schools and Training Colleges in view. It differs however very considerably both in plan and treatment from the usual elementary text-book on the English language. While affording in itself a complete survey of the subject, it is written as an introduction to study of a more advanced kind and is consequently arranged so as to supply that necessary groundwork which students who take up the study at the University grade, so invariably lack. The first seven chapters are devoted to a systematic examination of modern English, in the course of which some of the main principles of linguistic development are laid down from actual observation. Then a step is taken 'from the known to the unknown,' and the remaining six chapters deal with the past history of the language, a study which will now possess greater possibilities for the beginner, in consequence of the equipment in method acquired in the earlier chapters. The plan thus devised to form a convenient two-years' course, has obvious merits from the educational point of view besides its inductive methods and its abundant use of illustration. As in the preceding work the main emphasis is laid throughout upon fundamental principles. The object is not the accumulation of facts and rules, though at the same time a surprising amount of facts,—and interesting facts,—is gathered by the way, e.g., the statement of the conditions under which an initial aspirate is dropped (p. 73), or the explanation of the different pronunciations of *gh* in words like *rough* and *plough* (p. 144). It may however be questioned whether the Scotch phrase 'do you wish any more,' is rightly described (see p. 63) as 'quite impossible in English': it is certainly used in some educated circles in Norfolk. The sketch of the history of the language which follows, contains all that is needed at an early stage, and Professor Wyld has made a judicious selection of his material. English sound-laws, the vocabulary and the inflexions are all adequately dealt with, and the last chapter is devoted to a consideration of the place of English among other languages. This is a matter which almost invariably figures earlier in the ordinary text-book. But there can be no doubt about the logic of Professor Wyld's arrangement. The work thus concludes with a suggestive glance at the wider fields of comparative philology from which further information concerning the English language must necessarily be obtained, and the way is thus prepared for a more intelligent study of the wider course. As regards style, Professor Wyld's method of exposition is admirably adapted to the class of readers for whom he is writing. Everything is presented in a straightforward and interesting fashion. He has even dispensed with an exact phonetic notation and makes an ordinary English form of spelling serve the end he has in view. Occasionally there are some

defects of style, as in the following passage: 'The first critic who really pointed out the difference of accent and in the number of syllables of the older forms of English as compared with the modern was Gray the poet' (p. 105); but the expression generally is clear and lucid. The book therefore seems to supply a much-felt need, a need which all teachers of English at the higher stages must have appreciated at one time or another. In conveying well-chosen and useful information, and affording an insight into correct philological method, the work adequately fulfils its purpose, and is calculated to lay a sound basis for future and higher work in the study of English.

J. W. H. Atkins.

Aberystwyth.

The Accusative with Infinitive and some kindred constructions in English. By Jacob Zeitlin. New York: Columbia University Press. 1908. 8vo. xi + 177 pp.

In the historical study of English, accidence has in the past loomed a good deal larger than syntax, and it is a welcome sign for the future of language study that syntax is now coming to the front, more especially in America. Very little has been done up to the present, and there is ample opportunity for new and original work. Dr Zeitlin has made the best of his opportunity in the volume before us. After a summary of the various theories put forward from time to time as to the origin of the accusative and infinitive construction, he exemplifies the use of this construction in the chief Indo-Germanic languages and then discusses the main subject of his book, viz., the employment of it in English. In contradistinction to the vague generalisation of writers in the past, who have either attributed it wholly to the latinising influence of the early fifteenth century, or accounted for its earlier appearances by the influence of translations from the Latin, he shows very clearly that the construction was native to Old English and was used with ever increasing frequency in Middle English, entirely apart from the influence of Latin.

The question of this construction is fairly simple and straightforward. It was only the evidence that wanted bringing forward and the matter then becomes patent to all. Dr Zeitlin's discussion of more difficult and less familiar constructions is equally satisfactory. They include (1) the use of a substantive with infinitive as the subject of a neuter or impersonal verb, including the so-called 'inorganic *for*' construction, (2) the use of the infinitive to denote various shades of command, (3) the potential and optative infinitive, (4) the loose or parenthetical use of the infinitive. The discussion of a good many of these usages is highly controversial, but Dr Zeitlin is very happy in his illustrations, and one must agree with his conclusions in the main. Finally attention may be called to one passage in the book (p. 112) which should be borne in mind by all students of syntax, viz., the

danger of mere rule of thumb counting of the occurrence of certain constructions in different texts, as a guide to the history of the development of that construction, without any reference to or allowance for possible differences of subject-matter and method, necessitating differences of syntactic method.

ALLEN MAWER.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

Die altenglischen Handwerkernamen. VON WILHELM KLUMP. (Anglistische Forschungen, Heft 24.) Heidelberg: Winter. 1908. 8vo. viii + 129 pp.

Among the most useful contributions to Anglo-Saxon studies during the last few years are the succession of short monographs on different groups of words in the Old English Vocabulary which have appeared in this series. We have already had volumes on the names of mammals and of weapons; we now have one on the names of the various handicraftsmen mentioned in Old English literature. As the author notes in his introduction, the material for this volume is exceedingly small, for unfortunately, owing to the distinctly scholastic and religious character of the greater part of Old English literature, there are few references to common trades or occupations. The Colloquies of Aelfric, the Charters, and Biblical translations are the chief sources of our knowledge.

The author deals first with the general development of handicrafts among the Anglo-Saxons, throwing light upon the dark places by reference to the customs of other Teutonic peoples, and then discusses in detail the etymology, formation and usage of the various names found in Old English texts. The whole work is done very thoroughly and is an important contribution to Anglo-Saxon lexicography and to the study of Anglo-Saxon *realien*. At times the scantiness of the material has led to a certain over-elaboration of such as there is, and a good deal of the discussion of the remoter etymological affinities of the names seems somewhat out of place in a volume of this kind. Most of it can be found elsewhere.

While dealing with the names of handicraftsmen the author might well have included also the names of tools. The majority are to be found forming part of the compound names of the handicraftsmen, and the addition of the few others would have taken little extra space. A discussion of the technical terms of weaving in the Leyden Riddle would certainly have been useful. These omissions do not however detract from the excellence of the volume as it stands, and it is well worthy of its position in an excellent series of monographs.

ALLEN MAWER.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

Lytse Fryske Spraekleare. Westerlauwersk om 1900 hinne oangeande Fen G. Postma en P. de Clercq. Ljouwert, 1904. 8vo. pp. vii + 128.

Frysk Lês- en Taelboekje, troch P. Sipma. 2 Parts. Leiden, 1906. 8vo. pp. 67 and 68.

Yn eigen Tún. Frysk Lêsboekje. Fen J. J. Hof. 2 Parts. Hearenfean, 1909. 8vo. pp. 68 and 84.

Söl' ring Leesbok. Lesebuch in Sylter Mundart, von Boy P. Möller. Altona, 1909. 8vo. pp. viii + 164.

For some two thousand years at least, the land between the Flie and the Lauwers (the present province of Friesland) has been inhabited by an ancient branch of the Germanic stock,—one which has delighted to call itself by the name of 'free Frisians.' During all that long time they have been able to defend their land against the assaults of the North Sea, and to maintain their own speech against the encroachments of Saxon and Frankish, though not without serious loss in both respects; Friesland itself, and the range of the Frisian tongue, are smaller than they were some centuries ago. Yet the land is well-peopled, and the language is still in daily use over nearly its whole extent.

It is a fact well-known to every student of the Germanic tongues, that Frisian is the nearest relative of English, and it would probably be no over-statement to say that at the time of the conquest of Britain the Frisians were speaking practically the same language as the Saxons, Angles, and Jutes. Since that date their fortunes have lain widely apart. Whatever the reason may have been, the old Frisians showed little taste for the written word; as one of their own writers has said, they were afraid of nothing so much as pen and ink. The result is that with the exception of the old laws and other legal documents (dating from the thirteenth century to the early part of the sixteenth) there is no old Frisian literature to set over against that of the other Germanic peoples. The fall of Frisian independence in 1498 led to the introduction of Dutch as the official language, and in course of time the native tongue remained unrepresented in church and school, and even ceased to be commonly spoken in the towns. Yet it was in the seventeenth century, after this decline had set in, that Friesland found its first poet of note in Gysbert Japix (1603–66). After his day, however, with but few exceptions, Frisians who wrote at all preferred Dutch or Latin to their own tongue. When Boswell was in Utrecht in 1763, Dr Johnson wrote requesting him to procure some 'books in the Frisick language.' To this Boswell replied: 'I have made all possible inquiry with respect to the Frisick language, and find that it has been less cultivated than any other of the northern dialects; a certain proof of which is their deficiency of books....Of the modern Frisick, or what is spoken by the boors of this day, I have procured a specimen.' It is *Gisbert Japix's Rymelerie,* which is the only book that they have. It is amazing that

they have no translation of the bible, no treatises of devotion, nor even any of the ballads and story-books which are so agreeable to country people.'

'The only book that they have' was almost literally true, but that one book had much to do with the revival of Frisian in the nineteenth century, which mainly dates from the time when the bust of Gysbert was set up in the church of Bolsward in 1823. It is unnecessary here to trace the course of modern Frisian literature since that date; under the example of the brothers Halbertsma the former dread of pen and ink has disappeared, and during the past sixty years a surprising amount of Frisian has found its way into print. Important stages in the work are marked by the foundation of the Frisian Literary Society (*Selskip for Fryske Tael- en Skriftenkennisse*) in 1844, the introduction of a uniform spelling in 1876, and the publication of a dictionary under the editorship of the veteran writer Waling Dykstra, begun in 1896 and now approaching completion. These recent developments have perhaps not received so much attention outside of Friesland as they deserve. For comparison with English or the other Germanic languages it is no longer necessary to cite Frisian forms in the archaic and often grotesque spelling of Gysbert Japix and his editor Epkema, while the information now available as to the range of the Frisian vocabulary is immensely greater than it was half a century ago.

Like most of the small languages, Frisian has not escaped the pessimistic prophet. Even in the seventeenth century the pedantic friend of Gysbert, Simon Gabbema, was afraid that the language might die out before long, and all through the eighteenth century the outward signs of life were feeble enough. But the steady conservatism of the people has succeeded in preserving their tongue with very little change during the past three hundred years, and with an increase in the population it is now actually used by more persons than it was a century ago. According to recent estimates the number of Frisian speakers in the province itself is somewhere about 250,000, almost exclusively living in the villages and country districts. In all the larger towns of the Netherlands there are also Frisian societies, which hold regular meetings during the winter months; one of the favourite entertainments at these is the performance of Frisian comedies and farces, of which there is an incredible and steadily increasing number.

Improved means of communication, however, are rapidly enlarging the immediate area of Dutch influence in Friesland itself, and it is beginning to be doubtful how far the language would be naturally able to resist the effects of this. It has seemed to some of those who are strongly attached to their mother-tongue, that if their own language is to have a fair chance of survival under the new conditions, it can no longer remain a mere medium of every-day intercourse, but must be commonly known also in its written form. For this end steps have recently been taken towards making Frisian a subject of instruction in schools, and a special fund has been established for that purpose. It is to forward this movement that three of the books named at the head of

this notice have been prepared, and the following remarks suggested by them may give some useful information on the present state of the language.

The *Little Frisian Grammar* of Postma and De Clercq[1] is intended as a guide for teachers who are already familiar with the language in its spoken form. Being also written in Frisian, and naturally containing a good many technical terms, it is not the best book for the outsider to begin upon, yet even a cursory examination of it will reveal to the student a certain number of the most prominent features of the language. The preface begins by defining the subject-matter as the most usual form of *Westerlauwersk Lânfrysk*, and each of these words deserves some remark. *Lânfrysk*, the Frisian of the country districts, is used in contrast to *Stêdfrysk*, the Dutch with some degree of Frisian colouring which is spoken in the towns. *Westerlauwersk* is used instead of 'West Frisian,' because West Friesland is still current as the name for part of the province of North Holland, where Frisian is no longer spoken. Although the language is not quite uniform over the whole of Friesland (there being at least three main divisions), the only dialects which differ in a very marked way from the others are those of Hindelopen (*Hynljippen*) on the west and Schiermonnikoog (*Skiermûntseach*, Grey Monks' Isle) to the north-east.

On turning to the grammar itself, one notices at the outset the richness of the vowel-system, the simple vowels being denoted by no less than eighteen symbols (several of which have more than one value), the diphthongs by twenty, and triphthongs by five. For the better understanding of these one must still turn to the older grammar in Dutch by Ph. van Blom (*Beknopte Friesche Spraakkunst* 1889), or to the article by Prof. Siebs in the *Grundriss der germ. Philologie*, but there is good reason to hope that a full account from the pen of a Frisian phonetician may before long make its appearance in English.

A glance at the section on nouns shows that there are three genders, the masculine and feminine however being rarely distinguished, that cases have to a very great extent disappeared, and that the usual plurals are in *-en* and *-s*. The definite article is *de* with masculine and feminine nouns, and *it* with neuters. Adjectives have still weak and strong forms, distinguished by the presence or absence of *-e*, but the use of these is no longer the original one, and sometimes conveys a difference of meaning. The pronouns are very simple, the most interesting being *hja* or *hju* she, *hjar* her, also *hja* they, *hjar*, *hjarren* them, and the peculiar *jim* ye, *jimme* you (as a real plural; the plural of politeness, employed as a singular, is *jy*, *jo*). The indefinite 'one' is expressed by *men* in the nominative, but the genitive is *yens*, and the objective *yen*. 'Other' appears as *oar*, and 'each' as *elts* (or *elk*).

The verbal system is comparatively simple, though certain classes of

[1] Mr de Clercq, who resides at Veenwouden in Friesland, has not only a scholarly interest in Frisian but in recent years has done much to further the various movements connected with the language; to his kindness and hospitality I am indebted for much of the information on which this notice is ultimately based.

strong verbs present curious forms. The infinitive ends in *-e*, but after *to* the form is always *-en*, corresponding to the distinction between *-an* and *-anne* (*enne*) in Old English. There are two classes of weak verbs, of which the first has the infinitive in *-e*, past tense in *-de* or *-te*, and past participle in *-d* or *-t*; e.g., *heare* to hear, *hearde*, *heard*, or *dippe* to dip, *dipte*, *dipt*. The second class has the infinitive in *-je* (answering to OE. *-ian*), past tense and past participle in *-e* (for *-ede*, *-ed*). The forms of this are illustrated by sentences occurring on p. 70: *de sé scil ebje*, the sea will ebb; *de sé ebbet* (= ebbeth), *de sé ebbe* (ebbed), *de sé hat ebbe* (hath ebbed). This class is a very large one, and includes some interesting specimens of the Frisian tendency to convert *k* into *tsh*, e.g., *meitsje* to make, but p.t. and p.p. *makke*; *laitsje* to laugh, but *lake*; *ploaitsje* to pluck, but *plôke*. Among the various groups of strong verbs the most peculiar are those belonging to the 'drive' class, which present the type *driuwe*, *dreau* (drove), *dreaun* (driven), and the 'break' class, which run *brekke*, *briek* (broke), *britsen* (broken). Some of the commoner verbs, such as 'give,' 'do,' 'go,' 'stand,' have infinitives in *-n* (*jaen*, *dwaen*, *gean*, *stean*) and many irregularities in conjugation: the resulting forms are frequently of considerable philological interest.

The needs of the Frisian teacher having been provided for in this work, it remained to supply suitable reading-books for the children. The Frisian Literary Society promoted this end by offering prizes for the best ones submitted to it, and two of the successful competitors were P. Sipma and J. J. Hof[1]. The work of the former, as it contained exercises in spelling and grammar, was considered the more suitable for school-work; it was therefore published first, and has proved to be very useful. As the title indicates, it is intended to give the scholar practice both in reading and in conversation, and appears to be well adapted for these ends. In the first part each reading lesson is followed by a set of questions on the subject-matter, and in most cases by a number of words illustrating a special set of sounds. These word-lists deal first with the rich Frisian vowel system, and the method adopted may be seen in the following example from p. 4: 'One hears a short *a* in *ta*, *sa*, *pak*, *tam*' (etc.). 'One hears a long *ae* in *twa*, *hwa*, *pake*, *drave*' (etc.). These points are further emphasised by one or two lines in prominent type at the bottom of each page. Although all this is intended for teachers and pupils whose native tongue is Frisian, even the foreign student can draw some important inferences from it. For example, the peculiar change of falling into rising diphthongs is clearly shown on p. 23: 'One hears a sound *éa* in *beam*, *peal*, ... but it becomes *eá* in *beammen*, *peallen*. One hears a sound *ie* in *bien*, *kies*, ... but it becomes *ié* in *biennen*, *kiezzen*.' The consonants are similarly dealt with, but present fewer peculiarities; most interesting are the words which exhibit similar changes to English, as *tsjerke* church, *tsjerne* churn, *tsjef*

[1] Mr Sipma is a teacher, belonging to the western part of Friesland, but now resident at Warffum in the province of Groningen. Mr Hof, a journalist at Heerenveen, is a native of the south of Friesland, and is well known as a writer both of prose and verse under the name of 'Jan fen 'e Gaestmar.'

chaff, *tsiis* cheese, or recall older English forms, as *tsjettel* kettle, *sizze* say, *lizze* lie. The reading lessons give specimens of both prose and verse, in most cases taken from well-known Frisian authors. The second part, which is published separately and intended for older pupils, is arranged on similar lines, but takes up the more difficult matters connected with spelling and word-formation. A number of very well known pieces of Frisian verse are included here, and some of the prose passages give a good idea of various aspects of life in Friesland. To both parts are appended a list of the more unusual words, with explanations in simpler language. The whole arrangement and contents of both parts are evidently the result of careful consideration, and a thorough mastery of all that is given here would go far towards laying the foundations of a competent knowledge of Frisian.

Mr Hof's reading-book, 'In our own garden,' is entirely different in character, but no less interesting, and the whole of its contents centre round Friesland itself. Through both parts of it run a set of articles descriptive of the chief places of interest in the province, beginning with a journey by canal-boat from Stavoren (in Frisian *Starum*) to Stroobos, which is on the boundary of the next province, Groningen. Another five 'lessons' take the reader through the southern district, Gaesterland, and those in the second part cover the rest of the province, under the title of 'Round Friesland by tram and train.' These articles, which are illustrated with numerous views of the places and things described, are written in a pleasant conversational style, and convey a very great amount of interesting information. It would indeed make a pleasant summer holiday to go through Friesland with this reading-book as a guide, for Mr Hof has a keen eye for all that is distinctive and noteworthy in each place that he passes in his imaginary tour. Nor does he neglect the past history of the province, and in separate articles fuller details are given with regard to a number of notable events, such as the great floods of 1825, or famous men, such as Gysbert Japix and the brothers Halbertsma. Other lessons contain descriptions of Frisian life in summer and winter; the Frisians are famous for fast skating (called *hirdriden*, 'hard riding'), and there are some amusing anecdotes on this subject. A few pieces by well-known authors are included in the book, but with these exceptions the work is entirely from Mr Hof's own pen. As he is a skilled writer of Frisian, his language is not always the easiest for the foreigner to understand, but for that very reason the perusal of his book is extremely profitable. In two or three of the articles he draws attention to differences of dialect, especially in one of those on Gaesterland, a part which still retains many traces of the idiom formerly common to all the *Súdhoeke*, or south-west of the province, but now largely assimilated to that of the neighbouring districts. There is even a short poem in 'Gást'laensk,' of which one verse is as follows:

Hir binn' gin grutte stêdden,	Here are no great towns
Mei turren, wakker heech;	With towers very high;
In sé fin griene blêdden	A sea of green leaves
Formakket hir yens eech.	Rejoices here one's eye.

To the second part there is an appendix of common proverbs, some of which have close parallels in English, while others are thoroughly Frisian both in the idea and its expression. To the former class belong the following, of which a translation would be superfluous: 'As de dagen bigjinne to lingjen, bigjint de kjeld to stringjen'; 'As de kat útfenhûs is, stekt de mûs de stirt omheech'; 'Koarte rekkens jowe lange frjeonen'; 'De apel falt net fier fen 'e beam.'

The first article in the second part of Mr Hof's book is entitled 'Frisian outside of Friesland,' and is a brief statement of the fact that East Frisian is still the language of some 2500 persons in Saterland (*Sagelterlân*) in Oldenburg, while North Frisian maintains a more thriving existence on the west coast of Slesvig and the adjacent islands (Sylt, Amrum, Föhr, and Helgoland). It is estimated that North Frisian is now spoken by about 25,000 people, but it is broken up into a number of dialects, differing from each other to such an extent that Low German has become the usual medium of intercommunication. Of these dialects that of Sylt has been most cultivated, but only since the beginning of the nineteenth century. Within the past year or two there has been an increase of activity among natives of Sylt with regard to the maintenance of their own tongue, and one result of this is the *Sylt Reading-book*, prepared at the instance of, and published by, the Sylt Society in Altona. To the reading-book proper there is prefixed a brief account of the sounds and grammar of the dialect, written in German, and the perusal of this shows at once that North and West Frisian differ in many important respects from each other. The phonetic differences are so numerous that any account of them would take up too much space here, but one point of interest is the retention of *đ* in words like *brööđer* brother, *weđer* weather *kluađer* clothes, etc. It is preserved, however, only in the middle of words; where final, it has during the past sixty years been changed into *r*, so that *hiiđ* heath, and *hiir* hair, are now pronounced alike. This change has also taken place in many Danish and some Low German dialects. In the sketch of the grammar one notices that the neuter of the article is *dit*, and that plurals are formed by *-er*, *-en*, and *-s*. The adjective has no distinction of strong and weak forms. The pronouns exhibit some interesting forms as *jü* she, *höör* her, *hat* it; *i* ye, *juu* you; *ja* they, *jam* them; but most remarkable of all is the retention of the old dual forms *wat* we two, *unk* us two, *at* ye two, *junk* you two, and on the analogy of these the new form *jat* they two. Even the possessives *unk* and *junk* are employed, as *unk Drēng* our boy (son), *junk Faamen* your girl (daughter). In the verb some infinitives have no ending, others end in *-i*, as *help* help, but *mauki* make. As in West Frisian, there are also inflected forms, *tö helpen, tö maakin*. As examples of the use of these we have: *Ik wel di help*, I will help you; but *Ik kum om di tö helpen*, I come to help you. The infinitives without ending belong almost entirely to the various classes of strong verbs, the forms of which present many peculiarities.

The matter of the reading-book itself is remarkably good and full of

interest. First comes a section headed *Ual' Tialen* 'old tales,' containing much of the old folk-lore of the island. Then follows a short one on *Ual' Wiis* 'old customs,' including the 'beacon-burning' which takes place annually on St Peter's Eve (February 21). Earlier and later incidents in the history of Sylt are given in sections 3 and 4, followed by a short extract from the old comedy by Jap. P. Hansen, first published in 1809. In section 6 there are old Sylt proverbs and phrases, weather-saws, and lists of bird- and plant-names, while the last division contains a number of pieces in verse. In every respect Rector Möller's book will bear comparison with the two from West Friesland noticed above, and may do much towards keeping up an interest in the dialect among the natives of the island[1]. Another of these, Captain Nann Mungard, of Keitum, has also done good service in this direction by preparing a small dictionary, which was published last year under the title of *For Sölring Spraak en Wiis*. Whether the North Frisian dialects have a long or short life before them, enough has been committed to writing during the past century to preserve a record of their leading features, and these two books will remain valuable evidence of the Sylt tongue as spoken at the present time.

The lack of an older literature has naturally been of great detriment to Frisian and to its position among the Germanic languages. Its value for English philology has been greatly diminished by the loss of many words which must at one time have been in use, but have been unable to survive without literary support. Yet even in its present state Frisian is not without its importance for the study of English, and now that the means of investigating it are improving and multiplying, there is room for hope that it may in time receive more attention in this respect than has hitherto been its lot.

W. A. Craigie.

Oxford.

Die heilige Regel für ein vollkommenes Leben. Eine Cisterzienserarbeit des XIII. Jahrhunderts, aus der Handschrift Additional 9048 des British Museum herausgegeben von Robert Priebsch. (Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters herausgegeben von der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Band XVI.) Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1909. 8vo. xxii + 104 pp.

Ohne Zweifel hat sich R. Priebsch mit der Herausgabe dieser Handschrift, die nach seinen Feststellungen eine Cisterzienserarbeit enthält, jedenfalls aber einmal im Besitze eines Benedictinerklosters gewesen

[1] Both in Friesland and in Sylt the teaching of Frisian is done outside of the ordinary school-hours. In Friesland it is entirely voluntary on both sides. In Sylt rather more than this was done at first, but some limitations have recently been imposed by the Minister of Education. An article on the subject in the *Sylter Zeitung* for March 5 of this year speaks thus of Möller's *Leesbok*: 'Der ganze Inhalt...is derart, dass das Interesse der Sylter Kinder aufs lebhafteste geweckt und gefesselt wird. Wir sind überzeugt, dass dies Buch sich als eine starke Schutzwehr erweisen wird für unser sylter Friesentum; es soll nur erst recht fruchtbar gemacht werden für die friesischen Sprachbestrebungen; es soll nur erst unsern Kindern recht lieb geworden sein.'

ist, ein beträchtliches Verdienst um die Kenntnis dieser Art Literatur erworben. Von der Existenz der Handschrift wusste man, seit sie Priebsch selbst in seinem bekannten Werke beschrieben und Proben daraus mitgeteilt hatte. Das darin enthaltene Büchlein war von da ab unter dem Namen 'Londoner Marienregel' gegangen.

Eingehende Beschäftigung mit seinem Inhalt hat nun dem Herausgeber nahegelegt, ihm einen Titel zu geben, der es vermeidet, es von vornherein einer bestimmten Gruppe officieller theologischer Werke zuzuweisen. Mir wäre allerdings der Vorschlag, der auf Seite XVI gemacht wird, 'Richtschnur zu einem vollkommenen Leben' auch als Titel des Werkes noch lieber gewesen: der bestimmte Artikel und der terminus 'Regel' können noch immer die Vorstellung erwecken, als ob es sich hier um einen in grösserem oder kleinerem Kreise officiell anerkannten Codex handele, und nicht, was es mir zu sein scheint: um das Erzeugnis des frommen Eifers eines einzelnen Klerikers. Leider lässt sich nichts Näheres über die Herkunft der Handschrift feststellen: vielleicht enthielten gerade die beiden ersten, ausgekratzten, Zeilen eine lokale Angabe.

Um den guten Lehren in den Augen derer, für die sie bestimmt sind, das höchst mögliche Ansehen zu geben, sie aus der abstrakten Sphäre reiner Lehrsätze herauszuheben, wird alles unter die Ägide der Gottesmutter gestellt, deren Kultus gerade im 13. Jahrhundert zusammen mit dem ritterlichen Frauendienst den Höhepunkt der Konkretheit erreicht hatte. Ich glaube aber auch, dass das Werkchen in erster Linie für Nonnen bestimmt war, obwohl der Ausdruck 'geistliche kint' (vgl. 34_1) natürlich auch von Mönchen gebraucht werden konnte. Priebsch weist auf Arnsburg in Oberhessen als möglichen Entstehungsort hin: auch Cisterzienser*nonnen*klöster gab es in der Gegend eine Anzahl. Maria leuchtet also in allem voran: ihre Person stellt der Verfasser als den Sitz all der Tugenden hin 'dar uf alle orden gefundiret sind,' die Augen als den Sitz der Keuschheit, die Ohren: des Gehorsams, die Nase: der Bescheidenheit, den Mund: des andächtigen Gebets, die Hände und Füsse: der Arbeitsamkeit, Körper und Geist: der Armut, das Herz als den Sitz des Friedens, endlich die Seele als den der Charitas. Also die in erster Linie von Nonnen erwartete Tugend wird vorangestellt, und der Gehorsam folgt sofort: ganz anders die Reihenfolge in der von Priebsch aus Hermann von Fritzlar angezogenen Stelle, anders auch die, die von jeher in den Regeln der Orden beobachtet war: Armut, Keuschheit, Gehorsam. Es ist beachtenswert, dass die erste der drei Fundamentalforderungen, die Armut, erst später kommt: gewiss lässt sich daraus schliessen, dass sie für den betreffenden Orden nicht mehr an erster Stelle mit stand. Oder sollte der Grund *nur* in den anatomischen Verhältnissen liegen? Es folgt die Nase: auf sie sind die bescheiden blickenden Augen gerichtet, sie zeigt bei bescheidener Haltung nach unten: wiederum ein entschieden weibliches Motiv. Mit dem Munde, dem Sitz der allgemeinen Tugenden der Andacht und des Gebets, sind die Teile des Kopfes erledigt. Schon jetzt aber folgen Hände und Füsse: die Werkzeuge der praktischsten Arbeitsamkeit, einer Tugend,

die gerade dem Cisterzienserorden am höchsten stand, durch die in erster Linie er in Deutschland seine materielle Blüte erreicht hat. Was Wunder dass die Armut und Demut in den Hintergrund getreten sind. Vielleicht indes sind sie sogar mit Absicht unmittelbar neben die Arbeitsamkeit gestellt: eine Warnung vor den Konsequenzen für die Lebenshaltung, die erfolgreiches Schaffen mit sich bringen kann. Mehr als dies alles aber fällt der breite Raum auf, den die Erörterung der beiden letzten Tugenden: Friedsamkeit und Liebe-Charitas einnimmt. Haben sie doch auch jetzt noch—der Schluss von Kapitel VIII fehlt—den doppelten Umfang der vorangehenden sechs Kapitel. Und hier finde ich ein weiteres Argument für die Richtigkeit sowohl der Zuweisung des Werkes an den Cisterzienserorden, speciell an ein Frauenkloster, als der Feststellung der Gegend, wo es entstanden ist.

Obgleich der Deutsche Herrenorden seiner Regel nach kaum Beziehungen zu den Vätern der Cisterzienser, den Benedictinern, vielmehr nur zu Augustinern, Templern, Johannitern, im Strafcodex zu den Dominicanern hatte, bestand doch in ihren Zielen von vornherein eine sehr nahe Verwandtschaft zwischen den beiden für das mittelalterliche Deutschland so wichtig gewordenen Orden. Schon die Mönche des Monte Cassino legten den unterscheidenden Nachdruck auf die praktische Arbeit, die Sorge für die Verbesserung der Existenzbedingungen sowohl als die Seelsorge und die Betätigung christlicher Liebe in der Krankenpflege. Hier der Grund der tiefen Marienverehrung, hier wahrscheinlich aber auch der innerste Grund des leidenschaftlichen Widerstandes Bernhards von Clairvaux gegen die Lehre von der unbefleckten Empfängnis, die das echt Weibliche der Marienerscheinung zu verflüchtigen drohte. Arbeitsamkeit und Liebestätigkeit im Kleinen, kolonisatorische und christianisierende Tätigkeit im Grossen haben den Orden in der Folgezeit vor allen andern ausgezeichnet und ihm seine überragende Bedeutung in den germanischen Ländern gegeben. Knüpften nun jene deutschen Kaufleute, die vor Akkon das 'Deutsche Marienhospital' neubegründeten, an die Kranken- und Armenpflege und seelsorgerische Tätigkeit der Benediktiner an, so nahm der ein paar Jahre später aus der kleinen Gemeinschaft emporgewachsene 'Deutsche Ritterorden,' zumal seit Hermann von Salza an seine Spitze getreten war, den gesteigerten Kräften entsprechend auch jene umfassendern Aufgaben in Angriff: Bekämpfung und Bekehrung der Ungläubigen, Gewinnung ihres Landes für die deutsche Kultur, geistige und materielle. Was ist natürlicher als das Aufkeimen gegenseitiger Sympathie, wo die beiden Orden in nähere Berührung miteinander kamen! Das geschah aber in den hier in Betracht kommenden Gegenden zum ersten Male im westlichen Hessen, bald darauf in der Ballei Koblenz! Nun wird in dem Beispiele, für das Priebsch die Quelle nicht anzugeben vermag, in No. 30, der deutschen Ordensbrüder in einer bemerkenswert günstigen Weise gedacht.

Eine Nonne, die sich wegen ihres untadelhaften Wandels des direkten Umgangs mit der Gottesmutter erfreuen darf, wird von zwei Deutschordensbrüdern um ihre Fürsprache gebeten. Sie fragt, mit missbilligendem,

vielleicht auch neidischem Blick auf die feine Kleidung und die andern, der harten Regel *ihres* Klosters schroff gegenüberstehenden feineren Lebensgewohnheiten der Beiden ironisch, ob sie überhaupt Ordensleute seien. Die Antwort, die ihr zuteil wird: 'ja, der pabest hat den orden bestetiget, und ist unz gegeben wur alle unse sunde daz wir unserez herren zorn rechen sulen an den ungeloubigen,' musste die Klosterfrau erwarten, aber *sie* hört weniger die Feststellung der Konfirmation des Ordens durch Papst Innocenz III aus den Worten der Beiden heraus, sie denkt vielmehr an jene weitgehenden Vorrechte, die ihm von Honorius III unter dem mächtigen und bei Papst wie Kaiser gleich angesehenen Hermann von Salza gewährt waren, und die in der Geschichte der Orden wahrhaft einzig dastehen. In der Nonne feindlichen Worten und in ihrem Verhalten auch auf den Bescheid der Brüder hin, spiegelt sich die ganze, tiefe Erbitterung, der Neid aller der Kongregationen wieder, denen der schnell und mächtig aufblühende Deutsche Orden die reichsten Stiftungen wegschnappte, das beste Menschenmaterial, in socialer wie geistiger Hinsicht, entzog, deren religiösen Überzeugungen er mit seinem auf weltliche Dinge gerichteten Bestrebungen bitteren Anstoss erregte. Und dass dieser junge weltliche Orden trotz allem mit dem Oberhaupte der Kirche in weit unmittelbarerm Konnex stehen durfte als die alten in Jahrhunderten bewährten geistlichen Orden, dass er mit kluger Diplomatie auch die Gunst des ihnen allen wichtigsten Kirchenfürsten, des Mainzer Erzbischofs, sich gesichert hatte, machte den Neid noch grösser. Mit berechtigtem Selbstgefühl weisen die beiden Ordensbrüder darauf hin, weshalb sie solch exceptionelle Stellung einnehmen: Verteidigung und Ausbreitung des Christentums unter Aufopferung selbst des eignen Lebens, das Höchste was es im Zeitalter der Kreuzzüge gab, haben sie den in sicherer Distanz betriebenen Bestrebungen ihrer Konkurrenten entgegenzusetzen! Ich glaube kaum, dass überhaupt je eine Quelle dieser Erzählung aufgefunden werden wird. Sie wird unter dem unmittelbaren Eindruck aller dieser Verhältnisse entstanden sein. So viel scheint mir sicher: sie führt uns in eine Zeit, wo der Deutsche Orden mit seinem Auftreten noch immer etwas Neues, Unerhörtes war, wo er noch immer als ein Schmarotzer erscheinen musste, wo vielleicht die Kunde von seinem gänzlichen Fiasko in Siebenbürgen sich allgemein verbreitet hatte, aber die von den gewaltigen Taten in Preussen gerade erst anfing, bekannt zu werden. Doch ein Angehöriger des Cisterzienserordens hatte alle Veranlassung, die deutschen Ritter so zu feiern, wie es die Jungfrau Maria in der Erzählung tut. Er dachte an die schweren Misserfolge, die der Cisterzienser Christian seit 1215 dort erfahren, der erlösenden Rolle, die Hermann Balk mit seinen todesmutigen Deutschordensrittern dort gespielt hatte, des weitern enggeschlossenen Zusammenwirkens jener beiden äussersten Schildwachen des Christentums im heidnischen Preussenlande: des Cisterzienserklosters Oliva und der Deutschordensballei Preussen! Ich meine, wir können nur auf das westliche Hessen als den Schauplatz der Erzählung geraten.

Aber ich will das Beispiel noch zu Ende erzählen. Die Jungfrau nimmt der Nonne ihre Abneigung gegen die Ordensbrüder übel, und erscheint ihr erst dann wieder, als sie merkt, dass die Nonne den Grund ihres Fernbleibens wirklich nicht kennt. Sehr fein kommt in diesem Umstande zum Ausdruck, wie der Anstoss einer geistlichen Frau an weltlichem Leben doch das Natürliche ist, sich in ihrem Bewusstsein aufgelöst hat. Jetzt wird sie eines bessern belehrt. Ich mag es mir nicht versagen, den ganzen Passus hierherzusetzen, er ist derartig beziehungsvoll gefasst, dass sich an die Stellung dieser Erzählung innerhalb des Ganzen gewiss noch weitergehende Erörterungen knüpfen werden.

'Do sprach unser vrowe: "wi mochtez du mich me irzurnen dan an minen liben vrunden, di mich mit herzen erent und minnent und wûr allen dingen zu einer vrowen haben irwelet, und du di verwazest und irez lebenez bist geiergert?" Si vragete wer si weren. Do sprach vnser vrowe: "Ez sin di brudere dez *dudeschen ordenez*." Si sprach mit weinenden ougen daz si nicht en weste daz si di brudere also mit herzen minnete, und daz da wider di brudere si also gar wert hetten. Di mûter aller barmherzekeite warf iren mantel uf und hette under igligeme arme einen *dudeschen bruder* stende mit einen wizen mantele und eime swarzen cruce und sprach zu der clusen vrowen: "Sich hi, alsuz lip und wert haben ich di *dudeschen brudere*, wan si mich suderlichen lip habent und mich genzelichen zu muter und zu einer vrowen irwelet hant. herumbe so wil ich nimer wesen uf ertriche noch in himelriche, ich ein welle mine brudere und mine libe dinest man, di *dudeschen brudere*, bi mir haben." Nach disen worten so wur unser vrowe wider dannen si waz kûmen, und di closen vrowe hette di *dudeschen brudere* wurbaz meir vil werdere und libere dan andere geistliche lute.'

Ich darf mich nicht mit gleicher Breite auf eine Erörterung des zweiten uns vor allen übrigen interessierenden Beispiels, von der H. Elisabeth, No. 47, einlassen. Elisabeth, geboren 1207, im selben Jahre, wo der Deutsche Orden zum ersten Male nach Hessen kam, hatte seit 1229 in Marburg gelebt, war 1231 gestorben; Konrad von Marburg hatte dann im Juli 1233 vor der Mainzer Reichsversammlung gestanden, war wenige Tage danach erschlagen worden; die Gründung der Marburger Kommende hatte 1234 stattgefunden, Gregor IX im Oktober desselben Jahres jene fünfmonatige Frist für die Vernehmung der Zeugen der Wunder Elisabeths gesetzt, der ihre Heiligsprechung im Mai 1235 gefolgt war. Ob sich die Ergebnisse des Zeugenverhörs noch in einem römischen Archive vorfinden werden? Leider steht mir hier nicht zur Verfügung Dietrich's von Apolda *Biographie der H. Elisabeth* in der ersten Ausgabe von Lambecks *Bibl. Caesar. Vindobon.* (Wien, 1669). Dietrich ist 1283 nach der Einweihung der Elisabethenkirche in Marburg gewesen, wo er aus der mündlichen Tradition der von ihm überaus geschätzten Ritter schöpfen konnte.

Nicht einmal das erste Stück des ganzen Traktates, dem alle diese Erzählungen angehören, ist vollständig: es bricht mitten im achten Kapitel ab. Es ist mir überhaupt zweifelhaft, ob diese Handschrift je das ganze Werk, dessen Inhalt im Eingang skizziert ist, enthalten hat:

die Zahl von vier Schreibern, die Priebsch schon für das vorliegende verhältnismässig kleine Bruchstück eruirt, bestärkt mich darin. Auch ist es nicht einmal ausgemacht, dass das Werk überhaupt vollendet war. Ich habe den Eindruck, als ob hier die immer streckenweise fertiggestellte Reinschrift eines noch im Werden begriffenen Werkes vorliege, dessen Entwurf von einem, Ausführung aber von mehrern Verfassern herrühre, und das dann gar nicht fertig geworden ist. Auch *im* Text sind zwei grössere Lücken vorhanden. Sie sind auf folgende Art entstanden. Der Schreiber hatte nicht nur die letzten vier Zeilen der drittletzten Seite der ursprünglich vorletzten Lage, sondern auch das sich anschliessende letzte Blatt—man kann mancherlei Gründe dafür finden—leergelassen. Der erste Buchbinder hielt darum die Lage für die Schlusslage und band sie demgemäss ans Ende. Ihm lag also nicht mehr Text vor als wir jetzt haben. In der Folgezeit riss jemand nach alter Gewohnheit das leere Pergamentblatt ab, wodurch auch die andere Hälfte des Doppelblatts lose wurde und verloren ging. Der zweite Buchbinder verbesserte nicht den Fehler des ersten.

In seiner Einleitung gibt der Herausgeber—wie man es bei ihm gewohnt ist—in musterhaft klarer und konciser Form alles das, was man an Angaben über die Handschrift selbst erwartet. Auch die Bemerkungen, die sprachlich orientieren sollen, hätten kaum kürzer zugleich und inhaltsreicher gegeben werden können. Überhaupt steckt in der Publikation eine Masse Arbeit, weit mehr, als der flüchtige Blick zu erfassen vermag. Wie mühsam das Suchen nach den Quellen der einzelnen Erzählungen ist, weiss jeder deutsche Philologe, der die mittelalterliche Theologie nicht gleich seinem eignen Fache kennt. Und von wem lässt sich das sagen!

Jedenfalls hat uns Priebsch mit seiner schönen Arbeit ein Werk zugänglich gemacht, das nicht nur einen Hessen, wie ich es bin, interessiert, sondern in grossem Zusammenhange gewürdigt werden muss, ob man ihm auch, von künstlerischem Standpunkte angesehen, keine besondere Note erteilen kann.

Ich habe nur auf weniges aufmerksam machen können. Die eingehende sprachliche Untersuchung, die des Herausgebers Aufgabe nicht sein konnte, wird dem Denkmal die geographischen Grenzen noch verengen, die syntaktische wird dem Herausgeber darin Recht geben, dass wir in dem Grundtext ein originales, kein Übersetzungswerk vor uns haben.

Den Preis von 5 Mark für ein Buch von xxii + 104 Seiten, die grösstenteils Textabdruck enthalten, finde ich sehr reichlich bemessen. Eigentümlich wirkt dem gegenüber die Dürftigkeit der typographischen Wiedergabe aller der Zeichen, die nicht gerade häufig vorkommen, vgl. v, 9, vii, 29, ix, 4, vor allem die Seiten x, xi; am tollsten sind die Galgen wiedergegeben, die hier und da Absätze markiren: 4, $_{23.\ 25}$ hat man einem P den einen Zinken, 31, $_{4}$ einen andern abgebrochen und die so erhaltenen Strünke um einen flachen Winkel gedreht. Ein eigentümlicher Schwanz, der ein s vorstellen soll, ist 42, $_{30}$ und anderswo zu sehen.

G. Schaaffs.

St Andrews.

MINOR NOTICES.

Dr Aluigi Cossio, whose interesting volume on the *Vita Nuova* we recently reviewed, is resident among us, at St Bede's College, Manchester, and alludes somewhat pathetically to his 'exile,' and the studies wherewith he is endeavouring to solace it. The argument of his *L' Archeologia dell' Arte in Dante* (Estratto dal Giornale Dantesco XVII, 5, 1909)—which aims to shew that Dante, anticipating modern archaeology, realised the course taken by Classical Art, from Egypt by Crete to Greece, and thence to Rome—turns on the interpretation of two passages. These are (1) the description of the 'Gran Veglio' of *Inf.* xiv, 94 sqq., and (2) the famous canzone numbered XX in the Oxford Edition,

Tre donne intorno al cor mi son venute.

In connection with the first passage Dr Cossio has much to say on the recent discoveries in Crete; of the Canzone—as puzzling to interpreters as it is obviously important for Dante's mental history—he offers an ingenious exposition of which the least that can be said is that it is worthy of serious consideration.

In his discussion of Carducci's exegesis we are inclined to think the writer gives too little weight to Dante's studies in Bologna. Nor does he appear (p. 24) to have realised that neither Witte nor Carducci is responsible for the identification of the Gihon of Paradise with the Nile; since *Aethiopia* comes to the Vulgate through the LXX as the translation of 'Cush' in Gen. ii. 13.

Dr Cossio's interesting theory about Beatrice and Gemma, already broached in his previous work, reappears here in his interpretation of Canzone XX.

We cannot congratulate the Italian printers on their accuracy, though the type is characteristically clear and good. Not only are there misprints in the few English quotations (a well-known English Dantist figuring as 'Paget-Poynbee'!), but in Latin we have *polysemum* for *polysensum*, and even in Italian *degredata* for *degradata* and *Flegeronta* for *Flegetonta*; while Cinguenè and Ginguenè appear on the same page.

L. R.

In Mr T. H. Dickinson's edition of *Robert Greene's Plays* in *The Mermaid Series* (London: F. Unwin) the text is a reprint from Dyce's modernized edition of 1861, but is said to have been 'compared with the later collations' of other editors, whatever that may mean. The popular introduction is adequate and generally well informed, but it is not profound and is rather pretentious. The theory of stage history borrowed from Fleay is largely incorrect, and the discussion of the doubtful plays unsatisfactory: the aesthetic criticism, too, impresses us

unfavourably. The editor should beware of such sentences as 'Nash called him "the Homer of women," and that phrase is worth the entirety of *Strange News* in defending Greene's fame': they betray at once an uncritical acceptance of other writers' hasty identifications, and a dangerous gift of facile phrase. Each play is introduced by a short paragraph summarizing the information available, and there are a few footnotes to the text. To cite the popularity of Jonah and the Whale and the motion of Nineveh as evidence of the continued success of the *Looking Glass* is surely fantastic. We should have liked to see the worthlessness of the evidence for Greene's authorship of the *Pinner of Wakefield*, and the extreme improbability of the ascription, more strongly stated. Had it not been for the inscription on the title-page of the Chatsworth copy, no one would ever have dreamed of suggesting that the play was Greene's, and until that inscription has been shown to be older than the nineteenth century, the attribution is really not worth discussing. We suppose that it is the very slender dramatic merit of Greene's acknowledged works that makes his editors cling so pathetically to this breezy comedy. Mr Dickinson, by the way, has not thought it necessary to quote the title-pages of the original editions. The result is that the reader will search his volume in vain for any evidence that *Alphonsus*, *Friar Bacon*, or *James IV* are Greene's at all.

W. W. G.

Professor Arnold Schröer in his parallel-text edition of *Othello* (*Shakespeare's Othello in Paralleldruck nach der ersten Quarto und ersten Folio*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1909) has given us a very useful help to the study of the play. He prints the text of the first Quarto (1622) side by side with that of the first Folio, and gives the variants of the second Quarto (1630) in foot-notes. It is certain that, if texts are to be critically compared, this should be done by reading them side by side, and not by endeavouring to reconstruct one from another by the help of a list of various readings; and with a view to this, students of the play generally will find the present edition a great convenience, while the low price at which it is published places it within the reach of all. We can imagine that the comparison of the text of the first Quarto with that of the Folio, which is here made easy, might be a very valuable exercise in criticism for the young scholar. The editor seems to have reproduced the texts with great accuracy, and he claims that in some details his rendering is more accurate than that of the photographic facsimiles, which when the original is imperfectly printed, are apt to give an unsatisfactory result. The present volume is No. 14 of the *Englische Textbibliothek*, published under the direction of Professor Hoops.

G. C. M.

Dr Karl Jansen's treatise, *Die Cynewulf-Forschung von ihren Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (*Bonner Beiträge zur Anglistik.* Heft xxiv, 1908) is a summary of the literature which has gathered around the name of Cynewulf from the days of Humphrey Wanley to the present time. The author lays no claim to any title beyond that of a careful student of that literature, and his own personal opinions are confined to one page at the end of the volume, in which he summarily presents his own verdict on some of the questions at issue. It is somewhat to be regretted that a volume in Dr Trautmann's very valuable series should be devoted to a work of this kind. An elaborate statement and equally elaborate refutation of theories long since found untenable and relegated to the limbo of forgotten things, can serve no useful purpose. It will tend to check study of the original poems, by encouraging reliance on opinions taken at second-hand. A concise summary of the most recent views on some disputed matter may serve a useful purpose, but such elaborate volumes as the present are entirely out of place.

A. M.

Dr Otto Schlotterose's edition of the *Phœnix* (*Die altenglische Dichtung 'Phœnix.' Bonner Beiträge zur Anglistik.* Heft xxv, 1908), with notes, translation, vocabulary and other aids to its study, is a welcome addition to the somewhat scanty list of independent texts of Old English poems. The edition is the more welcome as the *Phœnix* is poetically one of the best of Old English Christian poems, at least in its earlier portion.

Dr Schlotterose is a devout follower of Dr Moritz Trautmann in his editorial methods, and though his careful revision of the text contains evidence of much good work, it is to be regretted that he is not a little more conservative in his methods. More especially it seems highly unsafe, in the present state of our knowledge of Old English metre, to make so many alterations for alleged metrical reasons. The translation is good, less pedantic than German translations often tend to be, and not slurring over difficulties by word for word versions which are as unintelligible in the translation as in the original. At the same time a translation seems superfluous in an edition which can only be intended for scholars. The same remark applies to some extent to the vocabulary. Etymological information of the kind supplied there is either superfluous or can be found better and more fully elsewhere. More useful is the printing of the text of the poem of Lactantius, so that we are able to judge of the poet's methods of composition for ourselves. There are also useful excursuses on the dialect, metre, and authorship of the poem.

A. M.

Mr C. E. Doble's edition of Goldsmith's Comedies and *Vicar of Wakefield* (*The Plays of Oliver Goldsmith together with the Vicar of Wakefield.* Oxford: H. Frowde, 1909) is a very pleasant book to read. It is well printed and liberally illustrated by reproductions of old engravings from various sources, and especially of Mulready's illustrations to the *Vicar of Wakefield*, published in 1843. The notes are in the form of a Glossarial Index, in which all necessary explanations are given, with many parallel passages from Goldsmith's miscellaneous prose works, and all the noticeable points of the text are alphabetically indexed. This is a very happy arrangement, by which the reader is comfortably encouraged to read the text without referring to the notes, and at the same time, when he pleases, he can get plenty of entertainment out of the notes read separately, including the pleasure of being constantly reminded of all the best things in the text. In an Appendix a history is given of the production of the two plays and of the *Vicar of Wakefield*, with a list of the passages in the latter which were altered or suppressed, and some notes on matters requiring special illustration. The book is an excellent piece of work, and published at a very moderate price.

We welcome the fifth edition of Mr Pollard's well-known and very useful book, *English Miracle Plays, Moralities and Interludes* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1909). It is practically a reprint of the fourth edition, with a few corrections and alterations, some of them due to suggestions by Prof. Skeat. As a popular guide to the subject there is no more convenient book.

Professor C. H. Grandgent writes from Florence with reference to the review of his edition of Dante's *Inferno* in the *Modern Language Review* for January 1910 (Vol. v, pp. 124 ff.): 'Inasmuch as my reviewer, Mr Paget Toynbee, devotes an appreciable part of his space to a complaint that I have not included his *Dictionary* in my list of "Bibliographical Abbreviations," I wish to correct at once the impression that I have been guilty of even unintentional discourtesy to so eminent a scholar. The list in question is, as its title states, merely an explanation of abbreviations, and consists in large measure of the titles of Dante's works and of books of the Bible. Much as I should have liked to include the *Dictionary* with Deuteronomy and *Convivio*, there was absolutely no excuse for doing so, as I have nowhere referred to it in abbreviated form. I have recommended the work in my Introduction, and have expressed my indebtedness to Mr Toynbee in my Preface, which, I believe, is the usual place for such acknowledgments. Indeed, it must have been the emphasis there laid on the helpfulness of his studies that betrayed Mr Toynbee into the statement that his *Dictionary* "has evidently been laid under contribution" by me "pretty frequently." I must confess to my shame that, while I have greatly profited by Mr Toynbee's researches in other quarters, I have certainly not opened that justly popular compendium more than fifty times in my life, and,

so far as I am aware, have made no use of it at all in the preparation of this volume. My critic has, it would seem, been similarly misled, by the warmth of my acknowledgment to Torraca, to assume that my notes "are very largely a compilation from the well-known Italian commentary" of that scholar. While even a fancied resemblance between my work and Torraca's can be only complimentary to me, I must, in justice to that commentator, disclaim a relationship that might seem to make him responsible for a system of exegesis almost exactly the opposite of his own and for almost countless interpretations at variance with his views. In point of fact, my work was virtually completed when his admirable edition appeared, but the abundance of fresh material contributed by him compelled me (as it must compel everyone who prefers fact to time-honored fiction) to make a thorough revision of the historical and biographical part of my annotation. I take this opportunity to say, as I ought to have said in the book itself, that the citation on p. 137 from Boccaccio's *De Genealogia Deorum Gentilium* is copied *verbatim* from the Venetian edition of 1472, the oldest source accessible to me; the three "misprints" go back, then, to that date. Allow me to add, in conclusion, that the term "bird-hunting," to which my critic takes exception, is not used by me as a synonym of "falconry": it means, not hunting *with* birds, as my reviewer seems to suppose, but hunting birds—just as "fault-finding" means finding fault, and "hair-splitting" means splitting hairs.'

[I of course readily accept Professor Grandgent's disclaimer as to the use (or the reverse) made of Professor Torraca's commentary and of my *Dante Dictionary* in his edition of the *Inferno*. No doubt numerous coincidences created a wrong impression. As regards the misprints in the quotation from Boccaccio's *De Genealogia Deorum* I am afraid Professor Grandgent does not better his case. He asserts that he copied the quotation *verbatim* from the Venice edition of 1472. In that edition, of which I happen to possess a copy, the passage in question runs (with the contractions expanded) as follows:—'Et inde Gerion dicta est: quia regnans apud Baleares insulas: Gerion miti vultu blandisque verbis: et omni comitatu consueverit hospites suscipere: et demum sub hac benignitate sopitos occidere.' For *vultu* Professor Grandgent prints *vulto*, and for *sopitos* he prints *sospites*. *Sospites* was substituted for *sopitos* in the Reggio edition of 1481. I have not seen the undated Cologne edition of the *De Genealogia* (Proctor, 1104), but I can state that all the other fifteenth and sixteenth century editions of the Latin text read *sospites*, except the latest of all, the Basle edition of 1532, which reads *hospites*. There can be little doubt, however, that *sopitos* is the right reading, and this was the opinion of Betussi, the author of the Italian translation (first printed in 1547), who renders 'adormentati.' The obvious correction *comitate* for *comitatu* was made by the editor of the Basle edition, and is apparently adopted by Betussi, who renders 'con ogni famigliarità,' but his translation of this sentence is too free to enable one to decide with certainty which reading he followed.

PAGET TOYNBEE.]

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

February—May, 1910.

GENERAL.

Biondolillo, F., Poeti e critici. Palermo, Trimarchi. 3 L.

Hudson, W. H., An Introduction to the Study of Literature. London Harrap. 5*s.*

Matthews, Brander, A Study of the Drama. London, Longmans. 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

Woodberry, G. E., The Inspiration of Poetry. London, Macmillan. 5*s.* net.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

General.

Bibliotheca romanica. 101. Boileau, Oeuvres. Le lutrin; 102—107. La Bruyère, Oeuvres. Les Caractères. Discours à l'Académie; 108. Maffei, Sc., Merope. Strassburg, J. H. E. Heitz. Each no. 40 pf.

Mélanges de philologie romane et d'histoire littéraire offerts à M. Maurice Wilmotte. 2 vols. Paris, H. Champion. 20 fr.

Latin.

Clark, A. C., The Cursus in Mediaeval and Vulgar Latin. London, Frowde. 2*s.* net.

Italian.

Barberino, Francesco da, Documenti d'amore, secondo i manoscritti originali a cura di F. Egidi. Fasc. 8. Rome, Società filologica romana. 4 L.

Boncompagno da Signa, Amicitia. Edizione a cura di S. Nathan. Rome, Società filologica romana. 5 L.

Carli Piccolomini, B., Commento sopra la canzone 'Hotti donato il cor di buona vogla' da un MS. del. sec. xvi, pubblicato da P. P. Clementini. Rome, E. Loescher. 5 L.

Cian, V., Ugo Foscolo. Pavia, Mattei, Speroni e C. 5 L.

Copelli, T., Il teatro di Scipione Maffei. Parma, Battei. 4 L.

Donaver, F., Antologia della poesia dialettale genovese. Genoa, Libr. editr. moderna. 3 L. 50.

D'Ovidio, F., Versificazione italiana e arte poetica medioevale. Milan, Hoepli. 8 L. 50.

Firenzuola, A., Novellen und Gespräche. Übersetzt und erläutert von A. Wesselski. (Perlen älterer romanischer Prosa, x.) Munich, G. Müller. 18 M.

Gnaccarini, G., Indice delle rime volgari a stampa che fanno parte della biblioteca Carducci. II. Bologna, Romagnoli d'Acqua. 10 L.

Ladenarda, F. E., G. Carducci. Vol. I. Palermo, Reber. 3 L. 50.

Maldè, E., Le fonti della Gerusalemme liberata, con nuova ragione critica. Parma, Tip. cooperativa. 4 L.

Maugain, G., Étude sur l'évolution intellectuelle de l'Italie de 1657 à 1750. Paris, Hachette. 10 fr.

Pascoli, G., Le Canzoni di re Enzio: La canzone del Paradiso. Bologna, Neri. 2 L.

Rossetti, W. M., Dante and his Convito: a Study with Translations. London, E. Mathews. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Selvatico, R., Commedie e poesie veneziane pubblicate per cura di A. Fradaletto. Milan, Treves. 4 L.

Vismara, S. M., La lirica italiana nel Rinascimento. Un capitolo di storia letteraria. Florence, Libr. editr. fiorentina. 4 L.

Spanish.

Celestina. Eine dramatische Novelle. Aus dem Spanischen von E. von Bülow. (Perlen älterer romanischer Prosa, XV.) Munich, G. Müller. 18 M.

Cervantes de Saavedra, M. de, La Ilustre Fregona, El Licenciado Vidriera. Edited by F. A. Kirkpatrick. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Churchman, P. H., Byron and Espronceda. Paris, Revue Hispanique.

Cotarelo y Mori, E., Fonología española. Como se pronunciaba el castellano en los siglos XVI y XVII. Madrid, 'Revista de Archivos.'

Menendez Pidal, R., L'épopée castillane à travers la littérature espagnole, traduction de H. Mérimée. Paris, A. Colin. 3 fr. 50.

Mérimée, E., Précis d'histoire de la littérature espagnole depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours. Paris, Garnier frères. 4 fr.

Rennert, H. A., The Spanish Stage in the Time of Lope de Vega. New York, Hispanic Society.

Provençal.

Dejeanne, J. M. L., Poésies complètes du troubadour Marcabru. Publiées avec traduction, notes et glossaire. (Bibliothèque Méridionale, I, xii.) Toulouse, E. Privat. 7 fr.

Levy, E., Provenzalisches Supplement-Wörterbuch. XXV. Heft. Leipzig, O. R. Reisland. 4 M.

French.

(*a*) *General.*

Millardet, G., Petit atlas linguistique d'une région des Landes. Contributions à la dialectologie gasconne. (Bibliothèque Méridionale, I, xiii.) Toulouse, E. Privat. 20 fr.

Nyrop, Kr., Fransk Verslære i Omrids. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 2 Kr.

(*b*) *Old French.*

Castets, F., La chanson des quatre fils Aymon, d'après le manuscrit La Vallière. (Publ. de la Société des langues romanes, XXIV.) Montpellier, Coulet. 30 fr.

Faral, E., Les jongleurs en France au moyen-âge. (Bibl. de l'École des hautes études. Fasc. 187.) Paris, Champion. 7 fr. 50.

(*c*) *Modern French.*

Allievo, G., Gian Giacomo Rousseau, filosofo e pedagogista. Turin, Tip. Subalpina. 3 L.

Beauquier, Ch., Faune et flore populaires de la Franche-Comté. Collection de contes chansons et traditions populaires. 2 vols. Paris, E. Leroux. 10 fr.

Betham-Edwards, M., French Men, Women and Books. A series of 19th Century Studies. London, Chapman and Hall. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Champion, P., La librairie de Charles d'Orléans. (Bibl. du xv^e^ siècle, xi.) Paris, H. Champion. 20 fr.

Chaponnière, P., Piron, sa vie et son œuvre. Paris, Fontemoing. 7 fr. 50.

Doumic, R., George Sand : Some Aspects of her Life and Writings. Transl. by A. Hallard. London, Chapman and Hall. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Dupuy, E., A. de Vigny, ses amitiés, son rôle littéraire. i. Paris, Soc. fr. d'impr. et de libr. 3 fr. 50.

Flament, A., Les écrivains belges d'aujourd'hui. Paris, Lebègue et Cie. 2 fr.

Flaubert, G., Œuvres complètes. Correspondance. i. Série. 1830—50. Paris, L. Conrad. 15 fr.

Gaiffe, F., Le drame en France au xviii^e^ siècle. Paris, A. Colin. 10 fr.

Giraud, V., Blaise Pascal, études d'histoire moral. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Lachèvre, F., Le procès du poète Théophile de Vian. i—ii. Paris, H. Champion. 20 fr.

Laumonier, P., Ronsard, poète lyrique, étude historique et littéraire. Paris, Hachette. 15 fr.

Laumonier, P., La vie de Ronsard de Claude-Binet. Édition critique. Paris, Hachette. 5 fr.

Lecomte, L. H., Histoire des Théâtres de Paris. Le théâtre de la cité. Paris, H. Daragon. 10 fr.

Maigron, L., Le romantisme et les mœurs, essai d'étude historique et sociale. Paris, H. Champion. 8 fr.

Maugain, G., Documenti bibliografici e critici per la storia della fortuna del Fenelon in Italia. (Bibl. de l'Institut français de Florence, i, i.) Paris, H. Champion. 7 fr. 50.

Melia, J., Les idées de Stendhal. Paris, Mercure de France. 3 fr. 50.

Michaut, G., Pages de critique et d'histoire littéraire (xix^e^ siècle). Paris, Fontemoing. 3 fr. 50.

Molière, Œuvres. Nouvelle édition rev. et augm. par E. Despois. ii. Paris, Hachette. 7 fr. 50.

Montaigne, Essais. Tome iv. Texte originale, accompagné de la traduction, en langage de nos jours par le général Michaud. Paris, Firmin-Didot. 15 fr.

Petschler, E., Scarrons 'Typhon ou la Gigantomachie' und seine Vorbilder. Berlin, Ebering. 5 M.

Plattard, J., L'œuvre de Rabelais, sources, invention et composition. Paris, H. Champion. 8 fr.

Rocheblave, S., Agrippa d'Aubigné. (Les grands écrivains français.) Paris, Hachette. 2 fr.

Texte, J., Jean Jacques et les origines du cosmopolitisme littéraire. 2e. édit. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Walch, G., Nouvelles pages anthologiques. Tome i. Paris, H. Le Soudier. 4 fr.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

General.

MEYER, R. M., Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte. Leipzig, Quelle und Meyer. 16 M.

WAGNER, R., Die Syntax des Superlatives im Gotischen, Altniederdeutschen, Althochdeutschen, Frühmittelhochdeutschen, im Beowulf und in der älteren Edda. (Palaestra, XCI.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 3 M. 50.

Gothic.

WRIGHT, J., Grammar of the Gothic Language and the Gospel of St Mark, selections from the other Gospels and II. Timothy. With Notes and Glossary. London, Frowde. 5*s.* net.

Scandinavian.

BLEY, A., Eigla-Studien. (Recueil de Travaux publiés par la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres, Université de Gand, XXXIX.) Ghent, E. van Goethem. 13 fr.

BRANDES, G., Samlede Skrifter, XVIII. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 8 Kr. 50.

FEILBERG, H. F., Bidrag til en Ordbog over jyske Almuesmål. 35. Hefte. Copenhagen, Akademisk Boghandel. 2 Kr. 50.

JACOBSEN, L., Studier til det danske Rigssprogs Historie fra Eriks Lov til Christian III's Bibel. I. Lydhistorie. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 5 Kr.

OLRIK, A., Danmarks Heltedigtning. En Oldtidsstudie. II. Copenhagen, Gad. 5 Kr. 50.

Rómveriasaga (Am. 595, 4°). Herausgegeben von R. Meissner. (Palaestra, 88.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 14 M.

RYDBERG, V., Skrifter. II. Faust och Fauststudier. Stockholm, Bonnier. 2 Kr. 75.

VINJE, A., Lyriske dikt. Eit utval ved J. Handagard. Oslo, Norli. 1 Kr.

WINTERFELD, A. VON, Henrik Ibsen. Berlin-Friedenau, Fischer. 2 M. 50.

Dutch.

FRANCK, J., Mittelniederländische Grammatik mit Lesestücken und Glossar. 2te Auflage. Leipzig, Tauchnitz. 10 M.

WINKEL, JAN TE, De ontwikkelingsgang der Nederlandsche letterkunde. III. Haarlem, F. Bohm. 7 fl. 50.

English.

(*a*) *General.*

JOYCE, P. W., English as we speak it in Ireland. London, Longmans. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

ORTON, C. W. P., Political Satire in English Poetry. Cambridge, University Press. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

SKEAT, W. W., An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language. New edition, revised and enlarged. London, Frowde. 38*s.* net.

(*b*) *Old and Middle English.*

PANZER, F., Studien zur germanischen Sagengeschichte. I. Beowulf. Munich, C. H. Beck. 12 M.

RICHTER, C., Chronologische Studien zur angelsächsischen Literatur auf Grund sprachlich-metrischer Kriterien. (Studien zur englischen Philologie, XXXVIII.) Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M.

SCHUCHARDT, R., Die Negation im Beowulf. (Berliner Beiträge zur germanischen und romanischen Philologie, XXXVIII.) Berlin, E. Ebering. 4 M.

SKEAT, W. W., Early English Proverbs. Chiefly of the 13th and 14th centuries. London, Frowde. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

(*c*) *Modern English.*

BLAESE, B., Die Stimmungsscenen in Shakespeares Tragödien. (Diss.) Berlin, E. Ebering. 2 M. 50.

BUTLER, CHARLES, English Grammar (1634). Herausg. von A. Eichler. (Neudrucke frühneuenglischer Grammatiken, IV.) Halle, Niemeyer. 7 M.

CANNING, A. S. G., Sir Walter Scott studied in Eight Novels. London, Fisher Unwin. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

COLERIDGE, S. T., Poems of Nature and Romance, 1794—1807, ed. by Margaret A. Keeling. London, Frowde. 3*s.* 6*d.*

CRAWFORD, CH., A Concordance to the Works of Thomas Kyd. III. (Materialien zur Kunde des älteren englischen Dramas, XV, 3.) Louvain, Uystpruyst. 25 fr.

CUNLIFFE, R. I., A New Shakespearean Dictionary. London, Blackie. 9*s.* net.

DIBELIUS, W., Englische Romankunst. Die Technik des englischen Romans im 18. und zu Anfang des 19. Jahrhunderts. I. (Palaestra, XCII.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 8 M.

DRAAT, P. FIJN VAN, Rhythm in English prose. (Anglistische Forschungen, XXIX.) Heidelberg, Winter. 3 M. 60.

ECKHARDT, E., Die Dialekt- und Ausländertypen des älteren englischen Dramas. I. (Materialien zur Kunde des älteren englischen Dramas, XXVII, 1.) Louvain, Uystpruyst. 10 fr.

ELLIOT, FITZWILLIAM, Further Essays on Border Ballads. Edinburgh, A. Elliot. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

FEUILLERAT, A., John Lyly: Contributions à l'histoire de la Renaissance en Angleterre. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

FITZGERALD, P., Samuel Foote. A Biography. London, Chatto and Windus. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

HEMINGWAY, S. B., English Nativity Plays, with Introduction. London, G. Bell. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

HOLZER, G., Die Genesis der Shakespeare-Bacon-Frage. Vortrag. Heidelberg, Weiss. 60 pf.

KER, W. P., On the History of the Ballads, 1100—1500. (British Academy.) London, Frowde. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

KOEPPEL, E., Deutsche Strömungen in der englischen Literatur. Rede. Strassburg, Heitz. 1 M. 20.

LOCHNER, L., Pope's literarische Beziehungen zu seinen Zeitgenossen. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der englischen Literatur des 18. Jahrhunderts. (Münchener Beiträge zur romanischen und englischen Philologie, XLIX.) Leipzig, Deichert. 2 M. 80.

Lützenau, F., Shakespeare als Philosoph. Leipzig, Xenien-Verlag. 2 M.

MacCallum, M. W., Shakespeare's Roman Plays and their Background. London, Macmillan. 10*s.* net.

Marlowe, C., Works. Edited by C. F. Tucker Brooke. London, Frowde. 5*s.* net.

Melville, L., The Life and Letters of W. Beckford. London, Heinemann. 15*s.* net.

Miller, F., The Poets of Dumfriesshire. Glasgow, Maclehose. 10*s.* net.

Milton, J., Comus. Being the Bridgewater MS., with Notes and a Short Family Memoir by the Lady Alix Egerton. London, Dent. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

Milton, J., Paradise Lost. Edited by A. W. Verity. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Moorman, F. W., Robert Herrick. A Biographical and Critical Study. London, Lane. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

Phelps, W. L., Essays on Modern Novelists. London, Macmillan. 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

Roe, F. W., Thomas Carlyle as a Critic of Literature. London, Macmillan. 5*s.* net.

Saintsbury, G., A History of English Prosody. III. From Blake to Swinburne. London, Macmillan. 15*s.* net.

Shakespeare, W., Complete Works. (Caxton Edition.) Edited by S. Lee. Vols. 1—4. Each 6*s.* 6*d.* net. Caxton Publ. Co., London.

Shearin, H. G., The 'That'-clause in the Authorized Version of the Bible. (Transylvania Univ. Studies in English, I.) Lexington, Kentucky, U.S.A.

Shelley, P. B., The Cenci. Edited by G. E. Woodberry. (Belles Lettres Series.) London, D. C. Heath. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Sichel, W., Sterne, a Study to which is added 'The Journal to Eliza.' London, Williams and Norgate. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

Straus, R., Robert Dodsley, Poet, Publisher and Playwright. London, Lane. 21*s.* net.

Suckling, Sir John, Works. In Prose and Verse. Edited by A. H. Thompson. London, Routledge. 6*s.*

Symons, A., D. G. Rossetti. London, Fisher Unwin. 5*s.* net.

Tobler, C., Elizabeth Inchbald. Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 2 M. 80.

Walker, H., The Literature of the Victorian Era. Cambridge, University Press. 10*s.* net.

Whitman, W., Poems. Selected and Edited by W. M. Rossetti. London, Chatto and Windus. 2*s.* net.

Winchester, C. T., A Group of English Essayists of the Early 19th Century. London, Macmillan. 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

Wolff, L., An Essay on Keats's Treatment of the Heroic Rhythm and Blank Verse. Paris, Hachette. 5 fr.

German.

(*a*) *General* (*incl. Language*).

Berger, L., Les femmes poètes de l'Allemagne du moyen âge au XIX^{e} siècle. Préface de A. Bossert. Paris, Perrin. 3 fr. 50.

Biese, A., Deutsche Literaturgeschichte. I. Band. 3. Auflage. Munich, Beck. 5 M. 50.

Gutjahr, E. A., Die Anfänge der neuhochdeutschen Schriftsprache vor Luther. Halle, Buchh. des Waisenhauses. 7 M. 50.

Lasch, A., Geschichte der Schriftsprache in Berlin bis zur Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts. Dortmund, Ruhfus. 12 M.

Priest, G. M., A Brief History of German Literature. Based on G. Klee's 'Grundzüge der deutschen Literaturgeschichte.' London, Fisher Unwin. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Vetsch, J., Die Laute der Appenzeller Mundarten. (Beiträge zur schweizerdeutschen Grammatik, I.) Frauenfeld, Huber. 3 fr.

Vogt, F., und M. Koch, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur. 3. Aufl. 2 vols. Leipzig, Bibliogr. Institut. 20 M.

Waga, F., Die Welsch-Gattung. (Germanistische Abhandlungen, XXXIV.) Breslau, Marcus. 10 M.

Wipf, E., Die Mundart von Visperterminen im Wallis. (Beiträge zur schweizerdeutschen Grammatik, II.) Frauenfeld, Huber. 2 fr.

(*b*) *Old and Middle High German.*

Beywl, C., Reimwörterbuch zu Ulrichs Lanzelet. (Prager deutsche Studien, XV.) Prague, C. Bellmann. 3 M. 50.

Boer, R. C., Die Sagen von Ermanarich und Dietrich von Bern. (Germanistische Handbibliothek, X.) Halle, Buchh. des Waisenhauses. 8 M.

Golther, W., Die Gralssage bei Wolfram von Eschenbach. Rede. Rostock, Leopold. 40 pf.

Gundacker von Judenburg, Christi Hort, aus der Wiener Handschrift herausg. von J. Jaksche. (Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters.) Berlin, Weidmann. 4 M.

Hoffmann, P., Die Mischprosa Notkers des Deutschen. (Palaestra, LVIII.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 6 M. 50.

Kittelmann, F., Einige Mischhandschriften von Wolframs Parzival. (Quellen und Forschungen, CIX.) Strassburg, Trübner. 2 M. 50.

Lüdicke, V., Vorgeschichte und Nachleben des Willehalm von Orlens von Rudolf von Ems. (Hermaea, VIII.) Halle, Niemeyer. 6 M.

Neidhart's von Reuenthal, Lieder. Herausg. von F. Keinz. 2. Aufl. Leipzig, S. Hirzel. 4 M.

Strauch, Ph., Die Deutschordensliteratur des Mittelalters. Rede. Halle, Niemeyer. 80 pf.

Vignola, B., Gli albori della letteratura tedesca, con una introduzione sulla storia della lingua e sulla civiltà germanica precristiana. Rome, Soc. editr. Dante Alighieri. 5 L.

Wilhelm, F., Sanct Servatius, oder wie das erste Reis in deutscher Zunge geimpft wurde. Munich, Beck. 12 M.

(*c*) *Modern German.*

Albert, E., Das Naturgefühl L. H. C. Höltys. (Schriften der literarhistorischen Gesellschaft Bonn, VIII.) Dortmund, Ruhfus. 3 M. 50.

Aschner, S., Die deutschen Sagen der Brüder Grimm. Dissertation. Berlin, Ebering. 2 M. 50.

Billeter, G., Goethes Wilhelm Meisters Theatralische Sendung. Mitteilungen über die wiedergefundene erste Fassung von Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahren. Zürich, Rascher und Co. 2 fr.

Bossert, A., Essais sur la littérature allemande. 2e. Série. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Brentano, C., Sämtliche Werke. Herausg. von C. Schüddekopf. x. Munich, G. Müller.

Buchmann, R., Helden und Mächte des romantischen Kunstmärchens. (Untersuchungen zur neueren Sprach- und Literaturgeschichte, vi.) Leipzig, Haessel. 4 M. 60.

Büchner, G., Gesammelte Schriften. In 2 Bänden. Herausg. von P. Landau. Berlin, Cassirer. 10 M.

Ehrhard, A., F. Grillparzer, sein Leben und seine Werke. Deutsche Ausgabe von M. Necker. 2te Auflage. Munich, Beck. 7 M. 50.

Eschmann, G., Annette von Droste-Hülshoff. Ergänzungen und Berichtigungen zu den Ausgaben ihrer Werke. (Forschungen und Funde, i, iv.) Münster, Aschendorff. 4 M. 75.

Evans, M. B., Der bestrafte Brudermord, sein Verhältnis zu Shakespeares Hamlet. (Theatergeschichtliche Forschungen, xix.) Hamburg, Voss. 5 M.

Fischer, J. M., Studien zu Hebbels Jugendlyrik. (Schriften der literarhistorischen Gesellschaft Bonn, vi.) Dortmund, Ruhfus. 2 M. 40.

Frankl, L. A., Erinnerungen. Herausg. von Stefan Hock. (Bibl. deutscher Schriftsteller aus Böhmen, xxix.) Prague, Calve. 5 M.

Geiger, L., Die deutsche Literatur und die Juden. Berlin, G. Reimer. 6 M.

Gleich, J. A., Ausgewählte Werke, i. (Deutsch-österreichische Klassikerbibliothek.) Teschen, Prochaska. 1 M.

Goethe, J. W. von, Gespräche. Begründet von W. von Biedermann. 2. Aufl. iii. Leipzig, F. W. von Biedermann. 4 M.

Goethe, J. W. von, Der junge Goethe. Neue Ausgabe besorgt von M. Morris, ii. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 4 M. 50.

Goethe, J. W. von, Werke. Herausg. im Auftrage der Grossherzogin Sophie von Sachsen. I. Abt., v, ii; IV. Abt., xlix. Weimar, H. Böhlau. 5 M. 80 and 6 M. 80.

Greven, E., Die Naturschilderung in den Dichterwerken von N. Lenau. Strassburg, Singer. 2 M. 50.

Gross, E., Die ältere Romantik und das Theater. (Theatergeschichtliche Forschungen, xxii.) Hamburg, Voss. 4 M.

Hahn, J., Julius von Voss. (Palaestra, xciv.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 6 M.

Hartmann, A., Historische Volkslieder und Zeitgedichte vom 16. bis 19. Jahrhundert. Gesammelt und erläutert. ii. Band. Munich, C. H. Beck. 12 M.

Hauri, J., Goethes Faust. 15 Vorträge. Berlin-Zehlendorf, Skopnik. 4 M.

Heine, H., Sämtliche Werke, ix. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 4 M. 50.

Heller, G., Die Weltanschauung A. von Humboldt's in ihren Beziehungen zu den Ideen des Klassizismus. (Beiträge zur Kultur- und Universalgeschichte, xii.) Leipzig, Voigtländer. 9 M.

Kämmerer, M., Der Held des Nordens von F. de la Motte Fouqué und seine Stellung in der deutschen Literatur. Frankfurt a. M., Diesterweg. 2 M.

Kullmer, C. J., Pössneck und Hermann und Dorothea. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 1 M. 50.

LANGE, G., Der Dichter Arndt. (Berliner Beiträge zur german. und roman. Philologie, XXXVII.) Berlin, Ebering. 4 M. 20.

LAUTERBACH, M., Das Verhältnis der 2. zur 1. Ausgabe von Werthers Leiden. (Quellen und Forschungen, CX.) Strassburg, Trübner. 3 M. 50.

LENZ, J. M. R., Gesammelte Schriften. Herausg. von F. Blei. III. Munich, G. Müller. 7 M 50.

LESSING, O. E., Die neue Form. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des deutschen Naturalismus. Dresden, Reissner. 4 M.

LUTHER, M., Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe, XXXVII. Weimar, H. Böhlau. 22 M.

MASING, W., Sprachliche Musik in Goethes Lyrik. (Quellen und Forschungen, CVIII.) Strassburg, Trübner. 2 M.

MEINERT, J. G., Alte teutsche Volkslieder in der Mundart des Kuhländchens. Herausg. und erläutert. I. (Neudrucke zur Erforschung des deutschen Volkslieds in Mähren und Schlesien, I.) Brünn, C. Winiker. 5 M.

MESZLÉNY, R., F. Hebbels Genoveva. Eine Monographie. (Hebbel-Forschungen, IV.) Berlin, Behr. 3 M.

MEYERHOF, O., Über Goethes Methode der Naturforschung. Ein Vortrag. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1 M. 60.

MUCKENHEIM, R., Der Strophenbau bei Annette von Droste-Hülshoff. (Forschungen und Funde, I, V.) Münster, Aschendorff. 1 M. 75.

NESTRIEPKE, S., Schubart als Dichter. Pössneck, Feigenspan. 5 M.

PAYER VON THURN, R., Wiener Haupt- und Staatsaktionen, II. (Schriften des Literarischen Vereins in Wien, XIII.) Vienna, Literarischer Verein.

PETSCH, R., Lessings Briefwechsel mit Mendelssohn und Nicolai über das Trauerspiel. (Philosophische Bibliothek, CXXI.) Leipzig, Dürr. 3 M.

PLATEN, A. VON, Sämtliche Werke in 12 Bänden. Historisch-kritische Ausgabe von M. Koch und E. Petzet. Leipzig, Hesse. 6 M.

RAFF, H., Paul Heyse. Stuttgart, Cotta. 2 M. 50.

REGEN, E., Die Dramen Karolinens von Günderode. (Berliner Beiträge zur romanischen und englischen Philologie, XXXIX.) Berlin, Ebering. 3 M. 50.

SADÉE, L., Schiller als Realist. Eine literarisch-psychologische Studie. Asch, C. Schneider. 2 M. 50.

SCHILLER, J. F. VON, Sämtliche Werke. Historisch-kritische Ausgabe in 20 Bänden. Herausg. von K. Berger etc. Vols. I—VII. Leipzig, Hesse. 4 M. 50.

SCHILLING, J., Deutsche Literatur des 19. Jahrhunderts. Riga, Neuner. 3 M. 60.

SPENLE, J. E., Rahel, Madame Varnhagen von Ense. Histoire d'un salon romantique en Allemagne. Paris, Hachette. 6 fr.

SPIERO, H., Paul Heyse, der Dichter und seine Werke. Stuttgart, Cotta. 2 M.

STADLER, E., Wielands Shakespeare. (Quellen und Forschungen, CVII.) Strassburg, Trübner. 4 M.

STAHL, E. L., J. von Auffenberg und das Schauspiel der Schillerepigonen. (Theatergeschichtliche Forschungen, XXI.) Hamburg, Voss. 7 M.

STEGER, H., J. C. Hallmann. Sein Leben und seine Werke. Diss. Leipzig.

STEIN, B., Katholische Dramatiker der Gegenwart. Ravensburg, Alber. 7 M.

Steinert, W., L. Tieck und das Farbenempfinden der romantischen Dichtung. (Schriften der literarhistorischen Gesellschaft Bonn, vii.) Dortmund, Ruhfus. 6 M.

Stern, M. R. von, Wilhelm Jordan. Frankfort o. M., Lüstenöder. 2 M.

Sternberg, K. von, Ausgewählte Werke, ii. (Bibliothek deutscher Schriftsteller aus Böhmen, xxvii.) Prague, Calve. 3 M.

Thomas, C., An Anthology of German Literature. London, D. C. Heath. 6*s.* net.

Vignola, B., Le donne nella vita e nell' arte di Arrigo Heine. Rome, Soc editr. Dante Alighieri. 2 L. 50.

Walzel, O. F., Das Prometheussymbol von Shaftesbury zu Goethe. Studie. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 M.

Williamson, E. J., Grillparzer's Attitude toward Romanticism (Dissertation). Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press. 54 cents.

Witkop, Ph., Die neuere deutsche Lyrik. i. Von F. von Spee bis Hölderlin. Leipzig, Teubner. 5 M.

Wollf, K., Schiller und das Unsterblichkeitsproblem. Munich, Beck. 2 M. 50.

Zincke, P., Die Entstehungsgeschichte von F. Hebbels 'Maria Magdalena.' (Prager deutsche Studien, xvi.) Prague, C. Bellmann. 3 M. 75.